


6, 26, 23

From the Library of
Professor Benjamin Breckinridge Warfield
Bequeathed by him to
the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BX 5930 .S644

Smith, C. Ernest 1855-1939.

In the household of faith



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

IN THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW
LAND. Crown 8vo, \$1.25.

CALL TO CONFIRMATION. A Manual
of Instruction for Candidates. Paper,
12 cents *net*; cloth, 25 cents.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
NEW YORK

IN THE
HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH

BY

THE REV. C. ERNEST ✓ SMITH, M.A.

RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF ST. MICHAEL AND ALL ANGELS,
BALTIMORE, MD.; EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE
BISHOP OF MARYLAND

AUTHOR OF "THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW LAND"
"CALL TO CONFIRMATION," ETC.

NEW YORK
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON AND BOMBAY
1896

COPYRIGHT, 1895, BY
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

TROW DIRECTORY
PRINTING AND BOOKBINDING COMPANY
NEW YORK

TO THE
RIGHT REV. WILLIAM PARET, D.D., LL.D.
BISHOP OF MARYLAND
AS A SLIGHT TOKEN OF AFFECTION
AND IN SINCERE ADMIRATION OF HIS EPISCOPAL WORK
FROM ONE OF HIS CHAPLAINS

PREFACE

THIS book is not meant to be controversial. It has not been my wish to point out the deficiencies of other Christian bodies, nor to magnify the differences between us and them. My only desire has been to strengthen our own Church people in the faith of the Gospel.

If necessary at any time it is certainly so in these days of multiplied activities within and without the Church of God. Quite recently the secular press noted the evangelistic labors of a Roman bishop in a place where "there is no [Roman] Catholic Church, and it is said not a [Roman] Catholic in the place." *

I mean not in the least to take to task this good bishop, nor any others who would, like him, seek to make proselytes. They have a zeal for God,

* Bishop Curtis, of Wilmington, Del., and Rev. Edward Mickle, of Cape Charles City, Va., will give a four-days' mission in a hall at Onancock, Va., beginning February 18th. Bishop Curtis has been very active in establishing churches on the peninsula of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. There is no Catholic church in Onancock, and it is said not a Catholic in the place.—*Baltimore Sun*, February, 1895.

but, nevertheless, a zeal, as I humbly believe, not according to knowledge. Believing this, I must, even at the risk of seeming to be uncharitable, tell Church people why they should cling closely to their Church, value her ministrations, love her for what she has been and is, and bring into her fold all, as many as they can; for what I concede to others that I also claim. If it be thought an ungracious thing to deliver the message to one's own, to speak the truth whatever that truth may be, to be faithful to one's own convictions and one's own sense of duty—so let it be. I am content to be in "the glorious company of the Apostles," and in the "goodly fellowship of the Prophets," who also, in their day, were adjudged to be unkind and uncharitable in their teachings.

But yet I hail those, who are separated from us, as brethren. I am not so blind as to be unable to recognize and admire the holy and devoted lives of very many among those who are not *one* with us. I am sure that such were made members of the Church of Christ in their baptism. With gladness and reverence do I acknowledge in all their good works the operation of the Holy Spirit, and I truly believe that they are very dear to the heart of Him who is our common

Lord. I trust we have a fellowship in their prayers as they have in ours.

Brethren! Separated as we are now, we yet trust that we shall be some day forever united. Meanwhile, "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved." *

* Rom. x. 1.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTORY,	3
II. GOD'S HOUSEHOLD,	21
III. THE BIRTH AND COMING OF AGE OF A NEW SISTER,	35
IV. THE SISTER IN ENGLAND,	53
V. THE SISTER IN SCOTLAND,	69
VI. THE SISTER IN IRELAND,	89
VII. THE DIVINE CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH,	107
VIII. THE HUMAN ORGANIZATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA,	129
IX. CAUSES OF THE GREAT PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH,	153
X. POPULAR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH,	175
XI. THE BIBLE,	197
XII. THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH,	219
XIII. THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,	237
XIV. THE PRAYER-BOOK IN THE CHURCH,	257
XV. THE HYMNAL, OR BOOK OF COMMON PRAISE,	271

I.

INTRODUCTORY

I.

INTRODUCTORY

“ The Moon above, the Church below,
A wondrous race they run,
But all their radiance, all their glow,
Each borrows of its Sun.”

—The CHRISTIAN YEAR, for the “ Sunday
called Septuagesima.”

“ YOU cannot put the Church too high for me, if you always keep the head above the body.”¹ In this saying of John Stewart, of Virginia, we have one of those “words of the wise,” which “are as goads, and as nails fastened by the masters of assemblies.”² We need never wish for a clearer statement of that “union which is betwixt Christ and His Church.” If we will but bear it in mind, we shall never forget that the Church “is subject unto Christ”³ in everything; and forgetting not this, we shall neither unduly magnify

¹ Recent Past, Bishop Wilmer, p. 90.

² Eccl. xii. 11.

³ Ephes. v. 24.

the Church as some do, nor depreciate her as do others. To us the full message of truth will always be "Concerning Christ and the Church."

But between the Church as St. Paul knew her, and the Church as we know her now, there are two great differences. In St. Paul's time she was but small, and her members for the most part insignificant and untaught: "Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble,"¹ had been called into her ranks. *Now* she is in every land, and her children are all sorts and conditions of men. There has been a glorious change: "The little one has become a thousand, and the small one a strong nation." This is the first difference. Would that the other were like it! But it is not. The once compact, undivided body is no longer one and undivided. Strife has entered in. She is no more "one in faith and doctrine, one in charity." The seamless coat has been rent. This is the second great difference.

And our joy at her onward march is saddened by the knowledge that Christ's own prayer for her unity—the unity that exists between Himself and His Father—yet tarries for its fulfilment.

To some Christians this breach in her ranks

¹ 1 Cor. i. 26.

may not seem so great a calamity. We have even heard some of these speak of divisions as if they were an advantage to the Church. "What are you going to do," such ask, "with organic unity when once obtained? That unity may mean a great, motionless, powerless machine." And, without waiting for reply, they go on to tell us that, as "Diversity means life" in the natural world, and "uniformity death," so it is in the spiritual world. "Diverse organizations with diverse methods may mean the speediest way of ushering in the bright morning of millennial splendor." We do not share this rosy view. On the contrary, we are under the firm conviction that the greatest obstacle to the progress of Christianity is what the Prayer-Book calls "our unhappy divisions."

God, we know, often brings good out of evil, and no doubt these very divisions have been productive of benefit. They have certainly not been altogether evil. Compensation has taken place. What has been lost in one way has, to some extent, been regained in another. We see this in the unanimous consent given to the great central truths of Christianity by those who, in other ways, are far apart. We can happily look in vain for that Christian body which does not believe in

one God, the Father, and in the one only begotten Son of God, who came into this world to die for man, and who after death rose again and ascended into heaven. So, too, shall we seek in vain for those who deny that there is any Holy Ghost, any resurrection of the dead, or life of the world to come. So, too, shall we find none who maintain that repentance and faith are not necessary to Christian men, and that it is not indispensable for us to live sober, righteous, and godly lives. Yet, after all, these are the essentials of religion.

Concerning methods of work and detail of worship, the discipline and polity of the Church, almost every sect of Christians has its own theory, but here, at least, there is no discord. Unity reigns supreme, and all can sing with heart and voice,

“We are not divided,
All one body we.”

But this, as Mr. Gladstone justly observes, “is a marvellous concurrence evolved from the very heart of discord.”¹ This, however, is what we mean by compensation, and a very remarkable instance of it. Christian dissensions have often

¹ Place of heresy and schism in the modern Christian Church. Nineteenth Century, August, 1894.

driven men into indifference, or atheism, as they drove the Emperor Julian, but the sight of this striking harmony may well win them back. Thus, from that which has caused men to waver in the faith, comes the very antidote to revive it: the brazen serpent of our generation is seen curing those dying of the serpent's sting. It is thus that God is ever undoing Satan's work. Compensation for loss is the order of His dealings with us.

But again. There is another good. What competition has done in this practical workaday world, it has done in the spiritual Kingdom of God. It would be strange were it not so, for the citizens of the one are citizens of the other, and the Law-giver is the same in both. We ourselves can see that it has provoked to energy and zeal and to good works. Again and again in past days there has stolen the spirit of slumber into the Church, and she has grown weary in well-doing: but God, seeing her peril, has provoked her to jealousy by them that were no people, and by a foolish nation He hath angered her.¹

We do not forget this. Yet we affirm that the spectacle of a disunited Church is Christendom's

¹ See Rom. x. 19; cf. Deut. xxxii. 21.

“open sore,” and that schism is not and cannot be according to the will of God.

We now, however, make a large claim on behalf of our Anglican, or as it is more commonly called, Episcopal Church. The signs of our times are teaching us that if ever there is to be a united Church again—one flock under one shepherd—it will be due to the work and influence of this Church. More and more do we find this belief spreading as the proofs are daily multiplying. Great hopes are centring upon her. We say this not boastfully. If ever boasting was excluded it is here. There is room for deep humility and for heartfelt thankfulness, but not for boasting. Manifestly she holds the keys. She cannot help doing so even if she would. Her position is unique. She *only* comes into contact with the great historic churches of the West and of the East, while she *alone* of historic churches is largely in sympathy with the work of those great bodies of Christians which are yet not so much divisions of the old Catholic, Apostolic Church, as churches established on a new basis. What may be in store for her we know not. The hopes she is inspiring in the hearts of her children may never be realized. Upon another, God may design to bestow the blessing of

the peace-makers, but all signs point to her as the chosen instrument of that peace which will uplift the hearts of all who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and in truth. When Archbishop Dionysius Latas, an archbishop of the Holy Eastern Church, was among us, addressing the great congregation gathered at the consecration of the Sixth Bishop of Massachusetts, he used these remarkable words: "All Christian churches will cast their eyes toward you in the future, when by the grace of God all take steps for the union of all the Christians under one authority and under one sceptre. In this hope I greet you as my brethren in Christ. I embrace your Church, this Church, as my Church." May the dear Lord speedily join in the bonds of a love which will never be dissolved those who are now separated from one another, and who are too often forgetful of the fact that they are all children of one Almighty Father, who reigns over and guards them all.

The Church of which this is claimed must indeed be unimpeachable in character, and in possession of extraordinary gifts. Is this the case? We believe that it is. There is, at any rate, no obstacle to a full and free inquiry as to whether it be so or not. This Church courts publicity.

She is willing to submit to the strictest examination as to all she is or has been.

Her first claim, then, is that she is a *safe* Church. Her records show beyond dispute that no human architect planned her palaces. "Her foundations are upon the holy hills,"¹ for she is "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the Chief Corner-stone."² We do not here imply, nor do we think it, that only within her fold is safety to be found. Even if an angel from heaven declared it, we could not believe that all the good and holy men who have lived and died outside her communion are separated from God's love, and unreached by the saving benefits of Christ's death. Such would be to us another gospel, a gospel inconsistent with God's love and the plain teaching of His word, as when He said: "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one flock and one shepherd."³ Surely, too, it is still now as in the past: "He that is not against us is for us."⁴ Here is the difference between us and our Roman Catholic brethren. They will not allow that outside of the

¹ Ps. lxxxvii. 1.

² Ephes. ii. 20.

³ St. John x. 16.

⁴ Luke ix. 50.

pale of their Church is there any salvation, save perchance through "invincible ignorance." We shrink from such a thought. With us the love of God is greater than the Church of God. Nay, after all, what are Methodists or Presbyterians, Baptists or Congregationalists, but Christians, even as we ourselves? Their baptism made them nothing less than members of Christ's Holy Catholic Church. Ah, then, if this be so, we may be asked, "What does it matter which Church?" It matters much. It is not all a question of safety. That first, but some things come after. This Church is of all the churches the most helpful, and has gifts to bestow which others have not. It is possible to cross the Atlantic in crafts small as the caravels of Columbus—the sport and plaything of every wave; but we prefer to travel by those swift steamers which can more speedily bring us to the other side. And we who are voyagers on life's ocean, an ocean which washes the shores of time and eternity, will do well to ask how *best* we can accomplish the journey.

Once, when Christ crossed the Lake of Gennesaret, there were accompanying Him "other little ships." All, so far as we know, reached the other side in safety. We know Christ's boat did. But

who would not have wished to be in the boat which carried the Master? True it is, that when the voyage of life is over, and we have entered the quiet haven where storms never rage, we shall find no party names. There none will care whether we were Churchmen or Baptists. There we shall be Christians only; followers of the Lamb, redeemed by His blood. Yet if there is one way better, more helpful, safer than another, we shall surely, if we are wise, choose that one way before all others.

And while we say this Church is such a means, let us also confess our belief, that in this we find the only justification for her existence in certain parts of our country; in places where others were before her. On what ground did she enter there at the eleventh hour? Simply because she has that to offer which those have not. Others may have Christ's own approval, and be doing His work; but she is Christ's bride—His body—and it is for this that all true churchmen would rejoice greatly if they could hear their separated brethren everywhere coming to their own beloved Mother and saying: "We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you."¹ She is build-

¹ Zech. viii. 23.

ing up, we believe, by her teaching and her system, the noblest type of Christian character ever seen on earth. In the vineyard of the Church are the fairest flowers grown.

We speak in no proselyting spirit. Of proselyting, indeed, merely for the sake of gaining converts and swelling the numbers of the Church—we wish none of it. But we do earnestly desire to gain others for their sake—for their own souls' good. Judged by her own claims, the Church may not be silent. Unless aggressive, she is but as the servant who buried his master's talent. She is as salt without savour. She has but a name to live. Claiming to have gifts from Heaven, she must tell men what she has received, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

But what is the Episcopal Church that it should make so vast a claim? Is it not the least of all the churches? By no means. The Episcopal Church is far from being a small one. But if it were, that would be no argument. We know what Bethlehem was to Judah and the whole world; "But thou, Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be

ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.”¹ But this Church is not small. On the contrary, she is mighty in the number of her members. There is, we know, no infallibility promised to mere numbers. A multitude may do evil. But whether men will hear or whether they will forbear, she is the largest church of English-speaking nations. She stands at the head of the list. She has 28,750,000 English-speaking members. The Methodists come next with 18,500,000; then the Roman Catholics with 15,300,000; then the Presbyterians with 12,000,000; then the Baptists with 8,180,000; and lastly, the Congregationalists with 6,000,000.² And this statement is more significant than it seems to be. English is destined to be the language of all the world. In Shakespeare’s time used by five millions of people, see what is its position to-day. Already it is native and dominant over one-fifth of the whole habitable globe. It is spoken all through North America and in the United Kingdom; in the West India Islands and in the islands of the Pacific. It is spoken from the Cape of Good

¹ Micah v. 2,

² *Vide* Whittaker’s English Almanac. The Anglican Communion is a unit. The Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists are subdivided.

Hope to the Zambezi River; throughout New Zealand and the Australian Continent. It is the language of the high seas, and of every maritime port of the world. It is the language of commercial life, and even of the international commerce of China and Japan. More than one-half of the world's newspapers are printed in it, and soon it will be the language of 260,000,000 in India. Now, of the millions using this tongue, the Episcopal Church claims a number larger than any other church. While year by year the English language is becoming intelligible to new regions and divers peoples, surely then to the church using this language God has committed the gospel of His Kingdom.

Three different classes of Christians may read these words: First, those who are Churchmen by birth or adoption; next, those who are members of some other Christian body; and lastly, those who "are members of no church."

A word to each:

To the Churchman we say, Love your church; be proud of her; thank God that you are a Churchman. "The lines are fallen unto you in pleasant places; yea, you have a goodly heritage."¹

¹ Ps. xvi. 6.

To the members of other churches:

Are you a Baptist? We are indebted to your church for its insistence upon baptism as something more than a mere rite or empty ceremony.

Are you a Methodist? We are indebted to yours for its insistence on personal religion.

Are you a Congregationalist? We are indebted to yours for its defence of the rights and powers of the congregation.

Are you a Presbyterian? We are indebted to yours for its noble stand for the rights of Presbyters.

Are you a Roman Catholic? We are indebted to yours because she has been jealous for the honor of the bride of Christ.

We have learned something from all. But still to *all* we say: "Yet show we unto you a more excellent way."¹

We do not, of course, here contend that "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America" is without faults. We are not indeed blind to the fact that with her as with everything else that the hand of man touches, there are manifold imperfections—imperfections however which we would only too thankfully see removed.

¹ Cor. xii. 31.

Yet we as frankly confess our belief that in no other church on earth is there to be found so much real aid to enable us to lead "a sober, righteous, and godly life" as we find in her, nor so much which will day by day bind us closer unto Him who is always our only Lord and Saviour. With us, she is the King's daughter, "all glorious within."

Now, finally, a word to those who have no church ties or pastoral obligations. You are afraid that you will get narrow if you tie yourself down to a particular church or congregation? You think it best to go to all churches in turn, believing that there is good in all? Forgive us if we say that this seems nothing less than the elevation of a fault into a virtue. Neglect of the pastoral relationship carries with it neglect of pastoral obligations and of pastoral duties. We have in metaphor spoken of Christian people as voyagers on life's ocean. Let us go back to the metaphor again and say, that they who are without any church relationship seem to us like the drifting derelicts which, abandoned by their crews, are driven backward and forward over the wild wastes of waters until they go down beneath them. In charge of no captain, showing

no lights, drifting under the influence of passing wind or unseen tide, they are a menace to vessels in their track. Unite with some congregation. Take up some work for Christ. Catch the inspiration which comes from united effort, and you will never, never regret it!

II.

GOD'S HOUSEHOLD

II.

GOD'S HOUSEHOLD

“ Awake and give the blind their sight, teach praises to the dumb,

O Mother Church ! arise and shine, for lo ! thy Light is come !
Till all the faithful through the world, God's one-elected host,
Shall welcome the outpouring of a brighter Pentecost ;
And there shall be, and thou shalt see, throughout this earthly ball,

One Church, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Lord of all.”

—NEALE'S “ The Vigil of St. Peter.”

THE revelation of the Church as a family appeals to our hearts. Its very simplicity is its beauty. It tells of familiar things ; of home and home life ; of kindly feeling and brotherly fellowship ; above all, of parents' watchful care and loving guardianship. Its word is that God is not only our God but our Father.

The Church is thus a great family circle with its centre where

“ The One Almighty Father
Reigns in love for evermore.”

This family life began at Jerusalem. From thence the Christian race sprang. To the Christian no place on earth can be dearer. Jerusalem is not of the Jews only. Mother she is of the Church below ; type she is of the Church above. "For our brethren and companions' sakes, we will wish her prosperity. Yea, because of the house of the Lord our God we will seek to do her good."¹

The members of this family are *all* who have been baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The living now number some 400,000,000! Many of these may be, and often are, unworthy of their privileges ; others have gone out from the family, and having abandoned all outward and visible membership, are living in open neglect of their plainest duties ; yet they have not forfeited membership in this sacred household. Once a child, always a child. The Parable of the Prodigal Son has taught us this. The prodigal may forget his father, but his Father always remembers him.

How great a body is this Church with its millions of children scattered throughout the world ! How like in this to that mighty ocean which

¹ Ps. cxxii. 8.

girdles the earth in its wide embrace—one undivided, surging mass—which is yet but millions of drops of water. Not only in this one respect, however, may we learn a lesson from the ocean. We speak of bays, and gulfs, and seas—what are these waters but portions of the same boundless sea? There is no real division and there is no essential difference. Chesapeake Bay is part of the Atlantic; Drake's Bay is part of the Pacific: yet both alike are parts of the same whole.

So it is with the Church; here known by one name, there by another, it is the same everywhere. It is God's Church; it is God's family. Let us learn a lesson from civil affairs. In America we have some sixty millions of citizens, every one of whom is a member of the American family. Yet when we speak of these in reference to the States in which they dwell, it almost seems as if we were dealing with many nations. There are New Yorkers and Virginians; Georgians and Californians, and some forty other divisions besides; yet they are all one family in the land. The States which give them their names are but sisters in the one family which lives from Maine to California, and from the Northern Lakes to the shores of the Gulf of Mexico. And the

Churches of England, of Russia, of Spain, of Greece, of Italy, and elsewhere are, in a similar way, but sisters too. They are as the States in the American Union; as the seas and gulfs which form portions of the ocean. Not really different churches, they are parts of one body. Language barriers, racial differences, civil boundaries, geographical divisions, and the like, have given them existence. But once called into being they have all received equal privileges, and have become equally responsible for the discharge of a common work. So there is but one Church, that which sprang out of Judah.

In the course of the centuries which have elapsed since the birth and early growth of the family, there has been a tendency on the part of one or more of the sisters to control the others, with the result that for mutual protection they have drawn closer to each other in efforts to withstand attempts at depriving them of independence. Owing to this and other causes, all national churches have at last become consolidated into three groups. These are :

- (I) The Oriental, or Holy Orthodox ;
- (II) The Latin, or Roman Catholic ;
- (III) The Anglican, or Anglo-Catholic.

THE ORIENTAL, OR HOLY ORTHODOX.

The sisters forming this group are to be found in Russia, Greece, Austria, Turkey, Egypt, Syria, Palestine, and the East generally. There is their rightful home. There they have been ever since Christianity was first preached on earth. These sisters are the oldest of all. In their territory not only did Jewish Christianity take its rise, but Gentile also. Jerusalem, cradle of Jewish Christianity, and Antioch, cradle of Gentile Christianity, are both alike seats of Archbishops of the Holy Eastern Church. It is the unspeakable privilege of this Church to show an unbroken succession of Bishops of Jerusalem from St. James the Just to the present day. Within the land occupied by these Eastern sisters all the great councils of the Church were held. It was in their language that the oracles of God in the New Testament were first given to men. The Holy Eastern Church has now 100,000,000 members and some three hundred bishops.

THE LATIN, OR ROMAN CATHOLIC.

The sister communities or churches which form this group are found in such countries as Italy,

Spain, and France. They are, alas, also to be found in territories rightly belonging to their Greek and Anglican sisters, as, *e.g.*, here in the United States. But since they have no right to occupy those fields, they are simply guilty of creating strife by dividing the household against itself.

There is one feature common to all the sisters of this group, which is unlike anything we see either in the Oriental or in the Anglican groups. They have practically given up all independence of thought and action, and have placed themselves under the domination of their sister in Italy. In Apostolic days, as we have said, and for centuries after, even to this day, the family was under the government of bishops, who as leaders were fully responsible for the welfare of the work committed to their charge. One of these leaders in old time, Cyprian, himself a bishop, expresses this relationship well: "The Episcopate is one, and each bishop has a share in it."

All this has been done away with in the Latin group. Bishops, of course, they have, for these are necessary to the very existence of any part of the Church; yet they hold an anomalous position. They are merely the agents of one of their

own order. In his favor they have for the present abdicated their own proper functions of guiding and ruling the children of the family. In this, history repeats itself. Centuries ago, in Scotland and Ireland, there were communities of monks which were presided over by one of their own order as Abbot, among whom was often found a bishop; not as the head of the community, but merely to ordain and confirm when called upon to do so, whose position therefore was very similar to that of the bishops among the Moravians at the present day. The bishop's position in this group is very much akin to that. Hence we are not surprised to find that where the office is of little account it is held by large numbers. In Italy alone there are said to be 47 archbishops and 262 bishops! What more need we say to make it plain that these bishops, living, as they do, under the shadow of the Supreme Pontiff, have but the name of bishop left to them, all real power and influence having long since been taken away.

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC GROUP.

The sisters which form this group may generally be known by their use of the English tongue.

Spread abroad into all parts of the earth, they are principally found in Great Britain and in America. The children of these sister churches are the most progressive and the best educated among the nations. They number nearly 300 bishops, over 31,000 clergy, and 60,000,000 to 70,000,000 of people.

The churches in this group are not so closely allied to each other as those of the Latin group. They have kept their independence. There is, however, a strong family likeness, so that often one has been mistaken for the other, not always for its good. The Presbyterians in Scotland, in days gone by, sought to destroy the Church in that country, under the idea that they were destroying the Church of England. The present agitation against the Church in Wales proceeds largely from the mistaken idea that she is an alien Church, imported from England; whereas she is in reality older than her English sister. Here too, in America, the belief that this Church was the same as that of England, once, for a while, cost her dear. In a sense she is the same, just as the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy are both alike parts of the same Atlantic Ocean. The methods of work, the standards of action, and

forms of service, and even the origin of the American Church, may, however, all be exactly identical with that of her sister in England, but she is, notwithstanding, another sister in God's great Family.

The differences which part these groups are of long standing. It is an old story, and we cannot go fully into it now. But this much we may say: that from an early time the sister in Italy sought to persuade the others that she was appointed the head of the family, and had received powers not given to any other. As far back as the time of a bishop named Victor, A.D. 196, who undertook to give orders to a bishop in the Greek Church, on the ground that his Church was superior, the trouble began. In Victor's case the whole Church promptly suppressed him, and for many years after no other Italian bishop was guilty of such presumption; but later, a favorable opportunity arising, the Italian sister's claims were again set forward and enforced, until one after another the ancient churches fell under her control.

The Church of England was one of these, yet only for a short time; for she rose up in her might and threw off that yoke as unlawful. Since then the Italian Church has done her best to bring

the "lost" back to her, but all in vain. Some of her methods, however, are strikingly suggestive of the comedy wherein the wife, having turned her husband out of doors, sends word to him that if he will only return she will freely forgive him all.

Of late, between some members of the Greek Church and our own, there has been a pleasing exchange of courtesies. One of our bishops was courteously invited by the Archbishop, the Patriarch as he is termed, to celebrate the Holy Sacrament in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. More recently still, at a late Convention service in New York, the Greek Archbishop of Zante, the Most Reverend Dionysius Latas, was present and received the Holy Communion. Those who saw the venerable Archbishop, in his blue and purple vestments, kneeling in the midst of his brethren of another race and of another speech, were ready to shed tears of joy, as they recalled the words of the Psalmist: "Behold, how good and joyful a thing it is, brethren, to dwell together in unity."¹

Later still, when the present Bishop of Massachusetts was consecrated to the Episcopate, the

¹ Ps. 133.

same Archbishop joined in the Laying on of Hands, and on that memorable occasion, not indeed the first,¹ the Anglo-Catholic and the Greek-Catholic streams of the Episcopate were virtually united. This man was a scholar: master of six languages; a student first of the University of Athens, where he spent four years; afterward of the universities of Berlin, Leipsic, and Strasburg, and finally of Oxford, he was one of those men whom the whole Church may well delight to honor.

One question remains. Are the denominations which have come into existence in recent years members of this body—this Family of God? Some of them, and as we think rightly, say not. "We are not," said Dr. Long, a Baptist minister recently preaching in Baltimore, "an ancient historic Church. We are new. In that sense the Catholic Church has the better of us." This cordial recognition of facts is worth much, both to him who makes it, to those who hear it, and to the Church, whose ancient character is thus unequivocal.

¹ Dean Stanley's footnote appended to an account of how, in 1871, the Greek Archbishop of Syra and Tenos took part in the consecration of two bishops in Westminster Abbey is inimitable: "It is interesting," he wrote, "to remember that this excellent person, not holding the double procession of the Holy Ghost, according to the Athanasian Creed, without doubt shall perish everlastingly!"

cally and voluntarily admitted. Similarly may we speak of other churches standing on the same footing; they too are new, not old. Although, let us repeat again, every baptized person is a member of the Family of God.

Yet how then, if this be so, it may be asked, can we maintain that the youngest sister in any of these groups is old? It is, we reply, all a matter of historical continuity. When Christ breathed on his Apostles in Jerusalem, he kindled, so to speak, the sacred fire to burn till he should come again. The Apostles were as torches kindled at it. The Protestant Episcopal Church is no other than a tongue of that fire. Late in coming, it was no new light when it came. In the old tabernacle and in the later temple there was a fire ever burning. It is conceivable that the priests might from it have kindled several fires at different times and in different places. But it would have been all along the same fire — sacred fire. It is because the flame burning brightly here is traceable back to the original fire at Jerusalem, that our Church is old.

III.

THE BIRTH AND COMING OF AGE OF
A NEW SISTER

III.

THE BIRTH AND COMING OF AGE OF A NEW SISTER

“ Late from this western shore that morning chased
The deep and ancient night that threw its shroud
O'er the green land of groves.”

—WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT.

HAD but the existence of this continent been known to the world some fifteen hundred years before it was, our Church might have had the honor of an Apostolic founder. When we remember that the Apostles “went everywhere preaching the Word,” we shall not think this at all improbable. On the contrary, we shall feel that some member of the Apostolic College would surely have paid a visit to this land.

As it was, however, Apostolic Christianity came to the shores of Britain when Britain was thought to be “the utmost bound of the West,” and there halted. Possibly some ardent missionary gazing over the Western Ocean, sighed sadly as he

thought there were no more worlds to conquer. He did not know of this mighty continent which lay beyond the waters. And so it was reserved for the American Church to be, as St. Paul, "one born out of due time." So, also, it was reserved for her to be not a whit behind the very chiefest of those who were in Christ before her.

When at last Christian men saw America, they gazed on a scene very similar to that which lay stretched before the eyes of the first missionaries to the remotest parts of Europe. Dense forests and a fertile soil were seen, awaiting the advent of a race higher than that of the natives in possession. Whence came these natives? In answer to this inquiry, a curious story is told of one Morgan Jones, a Welshman, which, it is said, points to the Welsh as "the rock whence they were hewn." Jones, with several of his companions, had been actually tied to the stake, to be tortured to death by the Tuscaroras, when he burst forth in prayer in his own native Welsh. That prayer saved his life. "The salvages did right well understand his speech," and they let him go! The conduct of the Indians was doubtless owing to some other reason.

But, whoever they were, they were not destitute of a belief in God. Vaguely they worshipped a

Great Spirit—whom, alas! they only ignorantly worshipped.

The privilege of leading the natives to a knowledge of this Great Spirit was seized by the voyagers who first reached these shores. These were not, however, what we understand as missionaries. Nor had they left their home in England to preach Christianity to the heathen. They were on business enterprises bent. But those were days when men did not keep religion and business apart. Rather did they remember Christ's words: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

What an insight do we get into the ideas of those early traders and voyagers as we look at one of their simple bills of lading, so unlike the complicated and formidable-looking documents in use among ourselves! There we read that "the goods are shipped by the grace of God," in such-and-such a vessel, "sailing by God's grace;" and the document always concludes with the prayer: "And so God send the good ship to her desired port in safety. Amen." It may have been but a form, but at least it shows, if nothing more, that they were not ashamed of their religion. They openly claimed the protection and blessing of

God. Such merchantmen, carrying with them one to be their minister in all holy things, were the first to proclaim in the Western world the Gospel of Peace.

As lying nearest to the Old World, we should have thought that at some place along the eastern shore would have been found the first record of so notable an event. But it is not here that we find the first traces of their presence. For these we must go West. In Golden Gate Park, in the city of San Francisco, there stands a tall Celtic cross bearing on the east side this inscription: "A Memorial of the Service Held on the Shores of Drake's Bay, about St. John's Day, June 24, A.D. 1579, by Francis Fletcher, Priest of the Church of England, Chaplain to Sir Francis Drake, Chronicler of the Service." On the west side the space is divided into four tablets, with the following inscriptions cut in the stone: 1. "First Christian Service in the English Tongue on Our Coast;" 2. "First Use of the Book of Common Prayer in Our Country;" 3. "One of the First Recorded Missionary Prayers in Our Country;" 4. "*Sol: Deo sit semper gloria.*"

It was not until August 13, 1587, nearly ten years afterward, that we hear of a similar service on this

Eastern coast. A colony had settled on Roanoke Island, in North Carolina (then in Virginia), and there it was that not only were the first services held on the Atlantic seaboard, but the first recorded baptism in the New World of a native convert took place. Twenty years after that baptism—in April, 1607—on the southern shore of Chesapeake Bay, at a place afterward to be known to the world as Jamestown, the same Church whose prayers had been heard at Drake's Bay and Roanoke was formally settled in the land as "the Church of England in the Colonies." That settlement was the birth of the American sister in the family of God, which thus in the year of our Lord 1607 entered upon her life. At Smithfield, Isle of Wight County, Virginia, stands to-day the oldest church-building of our faith in America. Old St. Luke's Church, built there in 1632, and rich in memorials of the past, is with us yet.

As we look around to-day in America, we see churches of many kinds, from that of Rome to that of the United Brethren. Where were they then? With one exception, they had either not come into existence at all, or so recently that they had no strength to undertake work in a new field. The various national churches of Europe

were, of course, in existence, and anyone of them might have proved a rival. But the only likely one was the Spanish. Spain and England were the two competitors for the supremacy of the seas. But the Church of Spain had ample work in the West Indies and on the Southern Continent to tax all her energies; and the Northern Continent fell, not only rightly, but of necessity, to the spiritual care and pastoral oversight of her Anglican sister.

The English Church nobly undertook the charge. When Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1588, gave £100 "for the propagation of the Christian religion in Virginia," it was an earnest of what that Church would do. It was a true indication of the spirit which dwelt within her. She would do a mother's part. The Archbishop of Canterbury at once, on the daughter's behalf, called for a general collection throughout the churches in his province, and bibles and prayer-books, communion plate and church vestments, money and men, were forthcoming in abundance. The Church gave of her best. Everything augured well for the future. Under godly, earnest, hard-working clergy, a fruitful harvest seemed certain.

But, sad to tell, after a while heavy clouds surged up over the horizon, and the light was

darkened in the heavens. The Mother Church was assailed by fierce foes, and she had to take thought for herself. All through the seventeenth century her trials continued, and on under the heavy German kings in the eighteenth, until she reached the low-water mark of her religious and spiritual life. Under such circumstances, what could have been expected of her daughter abroad? The features of the home-life were naturally reproduced. Indifference set in, and with it came "calm decay." With the dying out of the old race of clergy, others had come who were but needy adventurers, and the cause seemed lost. Like priest, like people. The salt was losing its savor.

But her greatest trial has not yet been told. She had not the Episcopate. Imagine it, ye who can—an Episcopal Church without the Episcopate! At first, in America, when there were "but a few of them, and they strangers in the land," it did not seem to matter so much that the nearest bishop was three thousand miles away; but afterward, "when they multiplied exceedingly," and the years went by, the evils of their orphaned condition became more and more visible and more disastrous. Every now and then they

would make strong efforts to secure the Episcopate, but there was always the same result: no bishop came. Why was this? What insuperable difficulties interposed? The ill-fated alliance between the Church and Cæsar was responsible for it all—for the strange spectacle of an Episcopal Church refusing the Episcopate to her own daughter. For the worldly honors of a State Church, the mother had parted with her freedom.

Church and State! We link the words together, but the things are far apart. Their union is as unnatural as that of June and December. It is forgetfulness of Christ's proclamation: "My kingdom is not of this world." It is folly. Every attempt to unite the Church with this world, or to permit it to lean upon the world, has been attended sooner or later with disaster. Either the Church has suffered, as in France, or both Church and State, as in Italy.

Yet, all the while, incomplete as was her organization, she was still "the Church," and men always spoke of her as such. Soon, indeed, it would be different. Darker days were coming; when even the empty title would be denied her. But as yet the worst had not come. That was only reached at our Revolution. Then the crash came, and she

appeared in the eyes of men no longer the Church of *their* land, but the Church of another land, and of America's foes. What, therefore, could they do but cast her out? And cast her out they did. So that she who had been first of all became last of all. Then, for a while, bitter hatred and persecution followed. Churchmen suffered as no other Christians in this land have ever suffered, until they might well have thought that the days of the Maccabees had returned. True, it was more as Tories than as Churchmen that they suffered; but they did suffer, all the same, and that for conscience' sake. Hardships, whipping, imprisonment, confiscation, banishment, were the lot of many of the clergy, some of whom died under their sufferings, while their churches were given up to the fury of mobs and to devouring flames. The ruin of the Church seemed complete.

There was destined to be one trial more before relief should come. She was between two stools. As if she had not suffered enough, the Mother Church across the sea, now looking upon her no longer as a daughter, cast her off. Thus, with all supplies stopped, and the hope of gaining the Episcopate farther than ever away, was ever a Church in a worse plight? Distrusted by those

from whom she had come; deprived, too, of the means of perpetuating her own existence, and scorned by those among whom she dwelt, her lot was indeed hard. She had, like the ship which carried St. Paul in the stormy Adriatic, fallen into a place where two seas met, with every prospect of being destroyed between them.

But the darkest hour is just before dawn. To the poor, distracted, forlorn Church help came at last, and that—perhaps most naturally—from a Church which had been tried like herself. Hard by the state Church of England there was another Church, with a lineage as pure as hers, and moreover free from bondage. It was the Church of Scotland. To this Church, when all hope of success elsewhere had faded away, American Churchmen turned to crave the blessing they needed:

Patriots informed with Apostolic light
Were they, who, when their country had been freed,
Bowling with reverence to the ancient creed,
Fixed on the frame of Scotland's Church their sight,
And strove with filial love to reunite
What force had severed. Thence they fetched the seed
Of Christian unity, and won a meed
Of praise from Heaven.

At last the tide had turned ; and at Aberdeen, in Scotland, on November 14, 1784, Samuel Seabury, of Connecticut, was made a bishop in the Church of God. Thus, 205 years after that service on the Pacific Coast, the Church in America became fully equipped. She was now a Church with seed within herself. That consecration was her coming of age. Henceforward she needed help from none. All her bishops, if so she had willed, might have derived valid consecration from Bishop Seabury alone.

Looking forward to the future, the Church in Maryland had met the year before and had organized under the title she still bears—"The Protestant Episcopal Church." But for a little while she refrained from exercising her rights. Three more priests of the American Church were soon to seek the Episcopate abroad. For this Church has always been obedient to the ancient canons, which provide that not less than three bishops shall take part in every consecration. These three priests were: William White, to be Bishop of Pennsylvania, Samuel Provoost, to be Bishop of New York, both of whom were consecrated in Lambeth Palace on February 4, 1787 ; and James Madison, September 19, 1790, to be Bishop of

Virginia—the last American bishop to be consecrated outside the limits of the United States.

On September 17, 1792, Thomas John Claggett was consecrated in this country to be the first Bishop of Maryland, and to him belongs the honor of being the first bishop consecrated on American soil. In him the Scotch and English lines of succession were united, all four of the American bishops joining together in the service. But even before that, in the General Convention which met at Philadelphia in 1789, the scattered fragments of the Church were brought together and welded into one harmonious whole.

This was the magnificent consummation of past struggles. Phœnix-like, our Church had arisen from her ashes, and a glorious future began to open before her.

When Boccaccio's Jew returned from Rome he asked for baptism, on the ground that no Church which was not divine could survive such gross corruptions as he had seen. In the same way, if men will only read the history of this Church of ours, and contrast it to-day with what it was about one hundred years ago, they may well say: "This is surely a Church built upon the foundations of the apostles and prophets, with Jesus

Christ Himself as the corner-stone : this is indeed a sister in the Family of God. A Church not divine could not have survived : she must have perished—ay, and ought to have perished ! ”

Think of it ! Our Church to-day has fourscore bishops and over 4,000 clergy, and is once more The Church. Of the future we have no fears, when we remember how magnificently she has come forth out of the dangers and trials of the past.

More in detail, we may show that its strength at the beginning of 1895 was as follows : Total number of clergymen, 4,323 ; organized parishes and missions, 4,870 ; present number of communicants, 580,507—an increase of 17,429 over the previous year. In the Sunday-schools there are 44,335 teachers and 400,566 scholars, while in the parochial schools there are 619 teachers and 7,995 scholars. During the year there were 60,317 baptisms and 42,385 confirmations. There are sixty-eight institutions, seven of which are under the direction of the General Convention, not including four celibate orders for men, twenty-two sisterhoods, and five schools or communities for deaconesses.

But these figures tell little of what the Church

has really been doing. It is by reference to individual dioceses that we can appreciate it better. Take, for example, Maine. It is anything but a favored diocese: there has been no immigration to speak of; yet hear what the present Bishop has to say: "I accepted and went to Maine, and found a diocese of but eighteen parishes, only seven of which were self-supporting, and having in all 1,600 communicants." This was 28 years ago. That diocese has now thirty-five clergy and 3,364 communicants. Behold how God has prospered her! And not her alone. Similar advance and increasing strength is the record of all our dioceses.

"We can best," says a bishop¹ still living, speaking of the growth of the whole Church, "appreciate the present by contrasting it with the past. In the year 1816 the youngest Episcopal church in Rhode Island was ninety-four years old, not a new parish having been formed since the year 1722. At the time of my ordination—in 1836—we had only 763 clergy and 590 churches." Thus in one man's lifetime has our Church made herself known and felt throughout our whole land.

The old Church is thus seen to be coming to

¹ Bishop Clark.

the front and taking her rightful place. For she was here before the Constitution of 1788-89.

It is one hundred and thirty years since Charles Mason and Jeremiah Dixon surveyed the land for two hundred and forty-four miles west from the Delaware River, and ran what is now known as "Mason and Dixon's Line," between Delaware, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. This line, often thought to be connected with slavery, was in reality the boundary between Lord Baltimore's grant and the grant made to William Penn. The work was begun in 1763, and occupied several years. Through the country—here a wilderness, and there rocky and mountainous—the mystic line ran. At intervals of a mile, a stone not unlike an ordinary milestone was set up. Every fifth stone was a "crown-stone"—so called because on one side of the stone was the coat-of-arms of Penn, and on the other of Baltimore. But above the arms of Baltimore was the coronet of his nobility. Long these stones were hidden in the brushwood of the forest. At last

"The white man swung the axe

Beside them—signal of a mighty change."

The land was cleared, and the stones were laid bare to tell their own story. Then were seen the

arms of Penn and of Calvert surmounted by the baron's coronet.

So the old Church—no longer hidden away—stands in the light, binding two nations into one spiritual union. On the one side are the arms of America, on the other the arms of England, and over all, as a distinctive mark, that which separates it from those out of the fold—the crown of spiritual nobility.

IV.

THE SISTER IN ENGLAND

IV.

THE SISTER IN ENGLAND

“ If there be prophets on whose spirits rest
Past things, revealed like future, they can tell
What powers, presiding o’er the sacred well
Of Christian faith, this savage island blessed
With its first bounty. Wandering through the West,
Did holy Paul a while in Britain dwell,
And call the fountain forth by miracle,
And with dread signs the nascent stream invest ?
Or He, whose bonds dropped off, whose prison doors
Flew open, by an Angel’s voice unbarred ?
Or some of humbler name, to these wild shores
Storm-driven ; who, having seen the cup of woe
Pass from their Master, sojourned here to guard
The precious current they had taught to flow ? ”

—WORDSWORTH.

THESE lines are the conjectures of the poet as he meditated on the beginnings of the Church in Britain. Who first preached Christ there ? Was St. Paul or Joseph of Arimathea, or Simon Zelotes, or Simon Peter, James the Son of Zebedee, or

Aristobulus, of whom St. Paul speaks in Rom. xvi. 10, Britain's Evangelist and Saint? We cannot tell; all have been claimed. Not, indeed, that the British Christians are worse off in this respect than the Christians of other Churches. Can they of Gaul and Spain, or even of imperial Rome herself, tell us the true story of the first coming of Christian men? Traditions, myths, legends, like the fairy-tales which charm our children, those there are in abundance; but who, we hopelessly ask at this late day, can separate the chaff from the wheat, or assure us with authority that it is not all chaff which the wind of truth will scatter away from the face of the earth? Some day we shall know; for, "as unknown, and yet well known; as dead, and behold, they live."¹ Meanwhile we can honor their memory, and hear them, though dead, yet speak again. We somewhat wonder this has not been done; for to do honor to unknown benefactors is not a new or strange idea. We have but to look around us to see such memorials everywhere. There is Maryland's tribute to her heroic dead, commemorating those who in Revolutionary times saved the Carolinas. Another there is in the little town of

¹ ii. Cor. 6, 9.

Gettysburg, where during the civil war 200,000 men fought in a three days' death-struggle. The black smoke of war has rolled away forever, but a silent witness to the dread nature of the conflict stands in the midst of the slain. It is the National Memorial Monument bearing this inscription: "TO THE UNKNOWN DEAD." At Fredericksburg, on the Rappahannock, in Virginia, not one, but many thousand headstones bear a like inscription.

How grateful a deed it would be, and how instructive, if the Church in Britain should set up stones for a memorial "To her Unknown Founders," and call it Britain's tribute to the Saintly Dead. They are worthy of it. True soldiers of the Cross were they, who, for the honor of their Lord, and for the souls of men, fought their fight and finished their course. We say again that we wonder this has not been done before. There are in some of the old Parish Churches across the Atlantic, lists of all the Rectors who have within their venerable walls exercised their ministry. They are set up, "plain for all folk to see." The names reach back to Norman times, and even farther still, to the times of the Danes and Saxons. We know the story they teach. They proclaim

the unbroken chain—the historical continuity—which connects the first of the names with the last. That is well. But a memorial raised by the spiritual children of the first builders, not of this particular temple nor of that, but of the great spiritual temple of British Christianity, would be better; it would be the noblest memorial ever set up in Britain; and by it, though dead, they would speak:

O Church of our fathers in England,
O home of the Living Lord,
Full fountain of faith for ages,
And witness firm to the Word!
From Alban, Augustine, and Aidan,
Paulinus, and Cuthbert, and Bede,
To our days, even ours, what armies
Of Christ his long triumph lead!

Saints, known to him only in heaven,
Or famed in their own despite;
Or spending and spent for others,
Or crown'd with the martyr-light;
Of whom the world was not worthy,
Who counted earth's riches as dross;
They are resting in God's own acre,
Their bed 'neath the Saving Cross.

The sin-defaced offspring of Adam,
While centuries onward glide,
Have grown in the field of England ;
The tares with the wheat beside ;
O visible fold of the Shepherd,
How oft in his sorrow surveyed,
As the myriad snares of Satan
His cause have again betrayed !

The history of Christianity in that land, like the history of Christianity everywhere else, falls into two distinct periods: One extending from the first preaching of the Gospel to the formation of a church as the Church of the land; the birth of a sister in the Royal Family. The other extending from that time onward, a period of subsequent growth and development. The first was the era of Missions, the beginnings of the Church—her birth and infancy we have called it;—the second, when, having come of age, a National Church entered upon her mature and independent life.

Now, what do we actually know of her birth and earlier life? We answer: Nothing with certainty. When we first hear a witness speak whose evidence all receive, Christianity had won its brightest triumphs. This witness is Tertul-

lian, who makes the statement that "even those parts of Britain hitherto inaccessible to Roman arms, had been subdued by the Gospel of Christ." These words were probably written just as the second century was closing. Origen, half a century later, writes, "the power of God our Saviour is even with those in Britain, who are divided from our world." From this time onward we begin to know more. Soon Britain has a settled Episcopate; for in A.D. 314 we find three British Bishops sitting as members of a Council meeting in France, then called Gaul. A century later, persecutions arise, and pagan rule follows; then the dark page of history becomes unreadable. But persecuted, the infant Church is not destroyed; cast down, she is not forsaken; her candlestick is not removed. She lives on, for she is destined to become a mighty power in the land: a true National Church which the Lord founded, and not man.

Yet all this was centuries before the year 597, memorable as the year of Augustine's arrival. How perverse an error, then, that Britain received her Christianity from Rome, when actually, within less than a quarter of a mile from where the first Roman missionary found a home, there stood a

little church in which worshipped the Christian Queen Bertha, having for her pastor a bishop of the Gallic Church! We do not undervalue Augustine's services, but we are not willing to exaggerate them. To another even more than to himself do we owe his coming at all; for it was simple obedience to a command of his superior which took him to Britain. In Gregory the Great, Augustine had a master like that French Bishop who said, "My clergy are a regiment; when I say, 'March!' they march." Gregory bade Augustine go forth and preach the Gospel to the kinsmen of the little boys whom he had seen for sale in Rome, and Augustine went. To his credit, he remained; for he might have returned to tell that the field was occupied. Britain, indeed, was not altogether the heathen land the good Gregory thought it. In Southern Britain, as we have seen, a Gallic bishop lived; in the West, several bishops, with an archbishop at their head, held possession of the land; in the North the Scottish Church was vigorously pushing its missions southward. For a century before and for two centuries after Augustine's arrival the old British Church was sending forth missionaries to the heathen—Killian to Bavaria, Willibrod to

the country of the Franks, Siegfried to Sweden ; above all, Boniface, from his native Devonshire, to find, as the Apostle of Germany, ample work and a martyr's crown among the German people.

Thus easily might Augustine have withdrawn from the work. But the harvest was great and the laborers few, and he remained. A true missionary bishop, he never saw his home again. Settling down almost within sight of the sea which washed the shores of his beloved Italy, he preached Christ to the pagan invaders of that part of Britain. He was the first Archbishop of Canterbury. As such we honor him. But Canterbury then meant only Kent, as the epitaph cut in the stone under which he slept abundantly proves : " Here rests Augustine, first Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, who formerly directed hither by the Blessed Gregory, Pontiff of the City of Rome, and sustained by God in the working of miracles, brought over *King Ædilbert and his nation* from the worship of idols to the faith of Christ, and having completed the days of his office in peace, deceased on the seventh day of the Kalends of June, in the same King's reign."¹

Those were, properly speaking, only the days

¹ Bede ii., Chap. III., page 115.

of mission-work, when no Church existed. One hundred years hence some Japanese ecclesiastical historian may trace the footsteps of English or American or Roman missionaries in Japan, but he will not speak of there having been a National Japanese Church. In a similar way England, for nearly seven centuries, was the field of several missionary bands, representing different Churches. It was not until these were united together that a native Church was a possibility. When these scattered forces were united, a Church in England and of England was the result, and the first period of Christian history had run its course, and the second had dawned.

The second period begins in the year 673. That was a notable year for England. Under Archbishop Theodore, who had become by mutual consent Primate of All England, this grand result was achieved. At a Council held at Hertford all the missions were united, and the Church of the Nation entered upon her separate and independent existence. Then all divergent parties, all diverse customs, were harmonized. That Council gave a new Church to Christendom.

In the course of the ages which followed she has had a checkered career. At one time she

even lay under the power of the Papacy and became corrupt and ready to die. At another, she was the bond-slave of the State. Wonderful, however, notwithstanding all, has been her growth. When the Council of Hertford was held there were but five bishops and one archbishop ministering to a few thousands of people. To-day there are two archbishops and fifty-four bishops bearing rule over 21,000 clergy and ministering to 29,000,000 people, scattered throughout 14,000 parishes. This is a mighty change. Yet it is not all. Wholly insufficient will our estimate be if we do not take into account those daughter Churches in the colonies of Great Britain which are rising up and calling her blessed as the mother of them all.

More than thirteen hundred years have brought their sweeping changes since Augustine was laid to his rest as Bishop of the Kentish people. How great those changes have been the epitaph on the tomb of Archbishop Tait will show: "The one great aim of his life was to make the Church of England more truly the Church of the People." The difference is great. The one shows Augustine as a Kentish bishop, the other Archi-

bald Campbell Tait as the Primate of All England.

After all, statistics tell but little. We cannot measure the influence exerted by the Church. She has been as leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal till the whole was leavened.¹ Among other influences we mention one particularly. As individuals have gifts, so have churches. It has been her peculiar gift to mould the home-life of her people as no other Church has ever done. Great as her influence has been elsewhere, it has been greatest in the home-circle. *There* has been her throne. She is emphatically a Church of the hearthstone, training whole households in the fear of the Lord. And this has been directly the result of her system. Her clergy, unlike the clergy of most of the National Churches of Europe, have been, as husbands and fathers, capable of becoming, with their families, wholesome examples and patterns to the flock of Christ. The lovely sight of families dwelling together in unity, knit in sweetest bonds of love, which forms no inconsiderable part of the charm of English social life, has largely drawn its inspiration from the

¹ Matt. xiii. 33.

family life at the rectory or vicarage. Here, most of all, is her wisdom manifest. They who, as God's ambassadors, have spoken to Englishmen for generations past of holy living and holy dying, have not been celibates or anchorites; they who have been called to comfort the bereaved of wife or child have been the better able to enter into the heart-sorrows of their people, for they themselves, in like manner, have been tried. Here has been one source of her great power. She has been a Church of the people and for the people—in the truest sense a National Church.

With the best educated men in Europe as her clergy—*Anglicanus clerus stupor mundi*—(the Anglican Clergyman the wonder of the world), as the phrase went in the time of Charles II., when divines from the continent flocked to England to learn the art of preaching, it is reasonable that she should commend herself to an educated people. The highest hail her as Mother, yet she is mindful of the lowest. At this moment she is educating a million more of the children of the poor in her schools than the State itself! Where is there another Church with such a record? We can find none.

This is no panegyric on that Church. We are not blind to her faults. We name one she has

arising out of her very strength, out of her conservatism, and it is this; an unwillingness to depart out of old paths and to seize new ideas. She has never in the past known exactly what to do with enthusiasm. Because of this she lost Wesley and the Methodists; because of this she was not the church of Milton and Bunyan, of George Fox and Richard Baxter. But she is wiser now, and conservative though she remains, she gives her benediction to all who loyally give her their help.

But whatever else we may say, whatever else we may think, this one fact will, we believe, be clear: This Church is not new, but old; a Church for whose origin we look into the dim and misty past. Some things, we admit, are none the better for being old. We do not prize our shoes or our clothing the more because they are old. Old bridges, old boats, old machinery, have no special charms for us. But in some cases we do value the old more than the new. Old friends are to be preferred to new ones. The new may prove just as helpful, just as valuable, just as reliable. But we do not *know* that they will. They are like Saul's armor in David's hands: they are not proved. So also we prefer an old Church. A new one may be perfectly safe, but we do not

know it, and in this matter we wish for certainty. We have been at pains to show that the Church across the seas, at one time our Mother, and since our Sister, was not a creation of Parliament, either in the sixteenth century or at any other time. Our Church here springs from the same stock. Thus it is that freely bishops and clergy pass over to England and take an official part in the services of the cathedrals and churches there. So, too, the clergy of that church come here and are at once recognized as brethren. We know no difference. We believe in the fellowship of saints. In Christ we are all united. With perfect independence of action, each Church is free to act for herself. But a deep bond of sympathy, deeper than sentiment, and cordial respect links us together. We are brethren in the Lord; members of the same Church, partakers of the same holy calling. We extend our hands across the waste of waters and exchange our greetings, and we recognize in those who throng her ancient temples of prayer, fellow-workers in the same spiritual temple we are building here. They are engaged on one part of the wall, we on another. They and we are alike members of the great family of God, children in the Household of Faith.

V.

THE SISTER IN SCOTLAND

V.

THE SISTER IN SCOTLAND

“ They've robbed thee of thine altars,
They've ta'en thine ancient name ;
But thou'rt the Church of Scotland
Till Scotland melts in flame.”

—COXE.

THE indictment is a heavy one ; would that it were not true. Doubtless the Presbyterian body, which has possession of what was once the patrimony of the Church of Scotland, believes herself honestly entitled to it. We are indeed sure that the many thousands of good men in that communion would not remain her members if they did not share this belief. Though by civil law the Presbyterian body is called the Church of Scotland, she is not Scotland's ancient Church ; not the Church of the saintly heroes of early days ; of Columba, Mungo, and Ninian, those three mighty men, who broke through the heathen hosts and preached the truth in Scotland,

when Scotland lay in pagan darkness, as of old David's three mighty ones broke through the ranks of the Philistines.

How came the Church of Scotland thus to lose her place and name? Rightly or wrongly, wisely or unwisely, her bishops clung to the falling fortunes of the house of Stuart and refused allegiance to William of Orange. William never forgave them, but at once sought the ruin of their Church. A servile Parliament empowered him to form a new Church on a basis "most agreeable to the inclinations of the people." A strange foundation this for any Church: the inclinations of the people!

In civil government the people can rightly say, and they only, whether they will live under a monarchical form of government or under a republican. But it is not so in Church affairs. Men may no more change with impunity the God-given Constitution of the Church than they may alter that letter of Scripture of which it is written: "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book."¹ The power and authority to do

¹ Rev. xxii. 19.

this had never been so definitely asserted before. It was indeed a new thing for a legislative body to commission its Chief Magistrate to originate a Church, and a bolder man than William might well have shrunk back from the task.

For the beginning of the Church in Scotland we must look to the time when the Druids held sway and celebrated in the dark recesses of the forests, which still fling their black shadows abroad, their grim rites to the terrible Woden, the god of War. In those days Picts and Scots, unconquered by Rome's legions, held Scotland, which then bore its ancient name of Caledonia.

Picts and Scots! These seem to have been not two nations, but several; differing widely from one another, and yet all alike members of one great Celtic family. Picts, Scots, and Britons, they were all essentially of the same race. Yet kinsmen though they were, the Picts sweeping out of their mountain fastnesses were continually harrying the Britons to death and spreading ruin and disaster in the southern land. As the early settlers in this country were ever in danger of an Indian massacre, so it was in Britain. There would be a rush, a fierce struggle, a scene of death, the glare of burning buildings, and the

bands of the Picts had gone, taking their captives and all they could lay their hands on. The simile is closer yet: The Picts were pagans, the Britons Christians.

In Campbell's poem of "Reullura" the poet sees in a Christian temple standing, we may presume, "where inaccessible to Roman arms the land had been subdued to Christ,"

" the statue of an ancient saint !
Fair sculptured was the stone,
It bore a crucifix ;
Fame said it once had graced
A Christian temple, which the Picts
In the Britons' land laid waste."

Who first preached Christ to the Picts and Scots? Were they from beyond the seas, as were the first teachers of Britain, or lived they nearer home? There is a story often told and partly believed, not unlike Britain's tradition of the visit to her shore of Joseph of Arimathea, which tells that in the time of Constantius, the son of Constantine the Great, a certain saint named Regulus, bidden by an angel, set sail from Patras in Achaia, where the Apostle S. Andrew had suffered martyrdom, bearing with him to a place of safety part

of the relics of the saint. Two years was Regulus, with his precious charge, storm-tossed over the seas, till he was wrecked on the Scottish shore, near where the city of St. Andrews stands. The story of Regulus and the story of Joseph of Arimathea may well stand or fall together; yet it is a curious fact that from the earliest time S. Andrew has been Scotland's patron saint.

But legends give only a glimmering and deceptive light. Fortunately we have something better, something more tangible. The earliest Christian memorials ever found in any part of the British Isles are certain monumental stones in Wigtonshire in the lowlands of Scotland. They are undoubtedly of the era of Roman British Christianity. The Latin inscription on one of them shows it to be a monument marking the graves of two priests. "Here lie"—so runs the epitaph—"holy and eminent priests, namely, Viventius and Mavorius." Gazing on those memorable stones, we the readier believe the story which tells us that in the Diocletian persecution two Christians, Marcus and Dionysius, fled northward until they reached the land of the Picts, among whom, as the pioneers of Christianity, they were the first to turn their pagan kinsmen from darkness to light,

and from the bondage of Satan unto the grace of God.

Beyond the wall of Antoninus on the north, which separated Caledonia from Britain, many hundreds of fugitive Christians, in that fearful hour of trial, may well have found a home. No Roman Emperor's edicts were respected there. That they were fugitives from Roman tyranny was enough to insure them a cordial welcome, for the Picts hated the very name of Rome. Can we believe that in their new home such refugees refrained from speaking of Christ? They owed it to the heathen, to themselves, and to their Lord to preach the word of God!

In this way, indeed, if in no other, might the Gospel have spread. We know that the persecutions after the death of Stephen, the first martyr, resulted in the Christians being dispersed abroad. Thus ever the blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the Church. Perhaps, too, the very slaves of the Picts had led their heathen masters to think kindly of Christians, and so prepare them for accepting Christianity when the time should come to choose between Christ and Woden.

It is not, however, until the fourth century that

we meet with undoubtedly authentic history. Then as through a rift in the clouds we see the name of Ninian writ in letters of gold. Ninian was a Briton, who, having been born about the year 360, of Christian parents, early devoted his life to the good of his fellow-men. During a visit to Rome, which he paid much as an Indian would visit Washington or New York nowadays, he had been consecrated a bishop, and on his return had founded a church and monastery. His work as bishop took him over an immense field. From the groves at the foot of the Grampian Hills, where the last of the Druids was slain, his diocese extended to Cumberland in the south. At the extreme limit northward—at Dumbarton—where the Roman wall terminates on its west side, the great Patrick was in all probability born, and Ninian was his teacher and father in God. Just twenty years after, in the year 432, the very year when Patrick landed on Irish soil as the missionary of the old British Church to Ireland, Ninian died. The outlook was a sad one when he passed away. The Roman legions had been withdrawn in 410. In Southern Britain soon afterward the Angles came to harry the land with battle-axe and fire; in Northern Britain

the Picts again swept over the land. Many Christians apostatized, and the century that followed Ninian's death was as if the sun had been darkened and the moon turned into blood. The powers of darkness seemed to have uninterrupted sway. At the end of that time however we find a man at work whose name of Mungo all Scotland reverences to-day. Building up the waste places, strengthening the things which remained which were ready to die, S. Mungo appears as the restorer of the paths to dwell in.¹ The desolation in the interval between him and Ninian is best seen in this; that though Ninian had consecrated many bishops not one was left in the land. When Mungo sought consecration it was from Ireland, where Patrick's labors had been so signally blessed.

In the closing years of S. Mungo's life there appeared the third and greatest of Scotland's Triumvirate: the Irish-born S. Columba, the Apostle of the Northern Picts. Columba, indeed, stands pre-eminent, and we know him well. Round about the names of Ninian and Mungo the mists of uncertainty linger. But here there is not a speck in all the great heaven of blue.

¹ Isaiah lviii. 12.

Columba is of the blood royal, and like another Prince Gaudama, for the good of his fellow-men, turns his back upon kingly rule and the palaces of the great. Leaving Ireland in 563 forever, he lands on the bleak and lonely island, about three miles long, now called Iona, to live for thirty-five years, and there to die. Never a bishop, he ruled as priest, with a mighty influence for good, the monastery of which he was the Abbot and founder. From that monastery missionaries went forth to Britain, France, Switzerland, Germany, and even as far as Italy. Even Rome herself sent youths to be educated there. Charlemagne sought professors there for his newly founded University of Paris. Iona was in truth holy and classic ground. All that Mecca is to the Mohammedan, Benares to the Hindu, Jerusalem to Jew and Gentile, that Iona had become to the whole of Western Christendom. Had all the twelve Apostles rested there, the reverence paid could not have been greater. Columba's prophecy was fulfilled to the letter.

Seven generations of monks lived their lives in this famous monastery, plain, simple men, some of them bishops, but the head of the Order was ever a Presbyter only, out of respect for Columba

their great founder, who was never raised to the episcopate, in days and in a Church when the episcopate meant not so much work and a diocese, as a degree in the Church of God, bestowed as a reward for, or recognition of, singular merit and unblemished holiness of life.

In the midst of an honorable and useful career it was suddenly to be cut off. Iona was not to suffer that decline in faith and morals which seemed to be the fate of all monastic institutions in the Middle Ages. In 802, about five years after the ruin of Lindisfarne in Britain, the Danes sacked and burned the home of the brethren. Undiscouraged they built another house, stronger and better than the first; but that, too, was doomed. Again the Danes came, slew the Abbot before the altar, and left not one stone of the monastery upon another.

“ They lighted the islands with ruin’s torch
And the holy men of Iona’s church
In the temple of God lay slain.”

From that blow Iona never recovered. Her glory had departed, her house was left desolate. Soon afterward, in 836, Kenneth McAlpine arose as King in Scotland, under whose rule, in 843,

the Scottish and Pictish Kingdoms were united. There, in a Church which he built at Dunkeld in memory of Columba, the relics of the saint were placed. Then the Roman influence suddenly appeared upon the scene. Another era had visibly dawned.

For six centuries onward the history of that Scottish Church is but the history of other National Churches in the West; it is the story of rise, decline, and fall. The Columban Church had always been free and independent. But she died out before her powerful rival. That rival, a Scottish Church under Roman influence, became more fully identified with the papacy than any other church in the British Islands. When even the Church of Ireland was unshackled and free she was Rome's vassal.

With primitive faith gone, with unmeaning ceremonies imported from abroad, with national characteristics effaced, the result might have been foreseen; nor was any prophet needed. Alliance with Rome meant separation from the true faith once delivered to the Saints. When the salt had lost its savor, who can wonder that corruption followed and the people cried out for Reform? That cry rang through Scotland. Was there

not a cause? Her state was worst of all the churches in the west, save that in Scandinavia. Preaching lately in his cathedral on the subject of unity, the Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore contended that the reformers ought first to have tried to reform the Church from within; but that "when the city of God was set on fire by the passions of men, instead of helping to put out the flames they fled from the city and returned to increase the conflagration—to add to the confusion." He was right. In England alone of all Christendom they stood fast, and there the Church stands grandly forth to-day; but in Scotland, Germany, and elsewhere they did it not. "Burn the nests," shouted John Knox, "and the rooks will flee away." It was fearful advice to give, but literally was it followed. From the fires he kindled the flames spread until abbeys, churches, precious documents, priceless libraries, were all alike reduced to ashes. In 1560 the revolution was at its height. When it had run its course, the Prayer-book had disappeared and there was not a bishop left. The Roman Church was blotted out in Scotland; for one hundred years thereafter there was no Scoto-Roman Bishop. Extraordinary to say, Rome suffered

her old succession to die out without making an effort to replace it.

Twice was the sacred line of the Episcopate sought and obtained; twice from Canterbury, not Rome. The Church thus restored, at one time held in honor, at another cast out and trampled under foot, yet grew mightily. When William landed in England there were fourteen bishops and one thousand clergy in Scotland; and had it not been for the fatal error of her bishops in standing by the fallen house of Stuart, the true Church of Scotland might to-day be the Church in which all the Scottish people should find their happiness and their only true home.

We do not want to reopen closed wounds. But Churchmen in Scotland can never forget that for one hundred years they were oppressed by law, and persecuted to death; that their Church buildings were burnt or torn down and their public services forbidden. More than four persons besides the family were not permitted to meet for divine service in any house; the penalty incurred by the officiating priest for disregard of this prohibition for the first offence was six months' imprisonment; for the second, transportation for life. It was a crime to baptize an in-

fant or to say a collect from the Prayer-book. During this Maccabean period of the Scotch Church her fourteen bishops dwindled down to four, and her one thousand clergy to but forty. Think of it! In one century ten bishoprics and nearly one thousand Protestant clergy were obliterated; and that under a distinctly Protestant government.

In 1792 these laws, as oppressive and barbarous as they were unjustifiable, were repealed, and since then our Church has grown steadily in Scotland. She has now seven Bishops and two hundred and sixty-three Clergy in that country. But it is only within the last few years that statutes as disgraceful concerning her have been repealed in England. The Church of England had been forced by the State into refusing permission to Scotch ordained Clergy to officiate at her altars. So rigorous and far-reaching was this law that no one ordained by a Scotch bishop could ever hold office in England! The priest ordained in any of the English colonies, in the American Church, in the Irish, yea, even in the Roman, if he would but abjure his errors and subscribe to the standards, could be admitted to the rectorship of an English parish, or become

bishop of an English Diocese, but one ordained in Scotland *never*. That law is blotted out now. But even to this day it is quite possible to find one here and there in England who, although a member of the English Church, is not ashamed to weaken the hands of his brethren in Scotland by turning his back on their churches and worshipping in the kirks of the Establishment which has dispossessed them!

We believe a grand future is before our Church in Scotland. She has passed through the discipline of suffering, and she is the stronger for it. Had it not been for her sufferings who can tell whether we of the American Church would ever have obtained the Episcopate? Seabury's application was denied again and again in England. For more than a whole year that grand man sought there in vain. When he turned to our Church in Scotland, the boon he craved was not denied him. American Churchmen ought never to forget this. Wherever indeed this American Church's history shall be made known in all the world, there shall also this, that the Bishops of the Church of Scotland did for her, be told for a memorial of them.

Not that the Episcopate is all we owe. She

also gave us our Altar Service. That from the spoiler she had saved, so that when her Bishops were about to lay hands on our Bishop Seabury, they placed this burden upon him that he should carry to the Church across the seas, of which he was to be the first bishop, her own pure liturgical service. For this double gift we hail that Church in Scotland as indeed to us a true "Mother in Israel."

It has been sometimes thought that the English Church and the Scotch Church are one. They are, in the same sense that the American and the English are one, but in no other. The Scotch Church is as independent as our own. Without an archbishop until the latter part of the fifteenth century she differed from every other Church in Europe. Her twelve dioceses of Caithness, Ross, Moray, Aberdeen, Brechin, Dunkeld, Dunblane, St. Andrew's, Argyle, The Isles, Glasgow, and Galloway were under no Metropolitan. When an Archbishop of St. Andrew's was created, he came as part of the paraphernalia of a Romanized Church. With the disappearance of Roman rule, he also disappeared.

At this day Scotland has no archbishop. The bishops choose one of their number as *primus*.

He acts as chairman at their meetings, and is usually their representative and spokesman; but he has no metropolitan authority, and while he has the right to receive certain appeals and possesses under the canons certain other prerogatives over his fellow bishops, the highest judicial authority is the Episcopal College, composed of all the bishops; the bishops themselves being appointed as ours are. They are chosen, that is to say, by the clergy of the diocese and by representatives of the lay communicants, a majority of both orders being necessary to a valid election, but the clergy only have the right to nominate. The highest legislative body is the Provincial Synod, formed of two Houses, one of the bishops, the other of the deans and representatives of the clergy.

Dwelling among Presbyterians, it is natural that she should have been led to insist much upon the Episcopal Order as part of the Church's Constitution, and to be zealous for a liturgical service. It was indeed inevitable that these should come into prominence, and the result has been that, falling back upon her Divine birth and nature, and on the traditions of a Catholic past, she has been attracting an increasing amount of attention.

Still, although among the gentry she is a power, and fairly strong with the professional classes as well as among the poor of the large towns, the bulk of Scottish people are still Presbyterian. Small though she be, she is yet strong and vigorous, and we may well believe her to be the leaven that is to work till the whole be leavened again.

VI.

THE SISTER IN IRELAND

VI.

THE SISTER IN IRELAND

“ Thy rival was honored, whilst thou wert wronged and scorned,
Thy crown was of briars, while gold her brows adorned ;
She wooed me to temples, whilst thou layest hid in caves,
Her friends were all masters, while thine, alas ! were slaves ;
Yet cold in the earth, at thy feet, I would rather be,
Than wed what I love not, or turn one thought from thee.”

—MOORE : “ The Ancient Church of Ireland.”

FROM the shores of Scotland on a clear day the blue line of the Irish coast can be distinctly seen. The earliest inhabitants, both of Scotland and Britain, who first looked out on that coast-line, would not have been true to their human nature unless they had sought to know something of that western isle. Nor would they, if Christians, have been true to their Master's teachings unless they had sought some way of imparting to its people the knowledge of the truths they themselves possessed.

Of the names of those who first responded to

this call there is not even a tradition left. St. John the Divine has indeed been claimed as the one to whom the earliest Christians in Ireland owe their baptism, but that not personally, only mediately through those who followed the "disciple whom Jesus loved." We, however, need no keen insight, no mind peculiarly adapted to weighing evidence, no prophetic vision, no providential guidance, to assure us that the first preachers in Ireland were natives of Britain. No need was there for missionaries to visit Ireland from the distant East. When once the Gospel had touched British soil, those who had freely received might be trusted to freely give.

When, however, the Divine message of peace and good-will to men which angels first proclaimed came to her shores, Ireland had long been an inhabited country. The Irish, indeed, boast of the antiquity of their race, and justly, if what they claim be true. The country, we are assured, was colonized before the Flood! Close by the Tower of Babel, we are told, one Milesius, taught both Hebrew and Irish. It was this Milesius who, afterward moving with his family into Ireland, found somebody there before him. Indeed, going farther back still, the Irish historian Keating

says: "To give an account of the first inhabitants of Ireland, I am obliged to begin at the creation of the World!" This is probably a slight rhetorical exaggeration, similar to that of the Welshman who, when constructing his genealogical table, remarked, with respect to one of his ancestors, "about this time Adam was born." With good cause, however, do the Irish boast of the extreme antiquity of their race:

" Their tribe, they said, their high degree,
Was sung in Tara's psaltery."

But the most enthusiastic Irishman will hardly claim that the stock is absolutely pure. The Emerald Isle, like America, has had its fascination for almost every nation. To her shores have come successive migrations, until at last no country in Europe contains so great a mixture of races. English and Scotch, Danes and Normans, Gauls and Spaniards, Northmen from Scandinavia, and Phœnicians from Carthage, if not indeed from more distant Tyre and Sidon, have all found a home in Ireland.

Naturally their religion has been somewhat cosmopolitan. There have been gods many and lords many. Druidism once flourished side by

side with the Phœnician worship of the Sun, while, notwithstanding the well-known fact that there are no snakes in Ireland, serpent worship is said to have once existed there. It was plainly a fruitful field for missionary effort, presenting some new problems and difficult complications to him who would win that island for Christ.

Now, when we first hear of a missionary settling among this heterogeneous population, he is confessedly not the pioneer. Christianity is there before his arrival, and, oddly enough, he is well aware of the fact. It was even the cause of his coming. This missionary was Palladius, who arrived from Rome in 431, sent by Pope Celestine to "the Irish believing in Christ." So runs the record. Naturally conjecture has been busy as to why he came at all. Was the Bishop of Rome at this early date seeking the lordship over his brethren? No; such attempts were not made for at least two centuries later. An occasional bishop of Rome might be at times somewhat arrogant, as the bishop of the world's metropolis, but taken as a whole the Bishops of Rome were for centuries earnest apostolic men, who were as free from claiming the superiority they now claim as are say the Bishops of London or

New York. Was he trying, then, to aid the Irish to put down the heresy of Pelagius as two Gallic Bishops had just helped the Church in Britain? We do not know that the Church in Ireland was infected with the heresy of Pelagius; but if so, the Gallic Church would have been the one which would most naturally have come to the rescue of the Irish, even if the purified and now strengthened British Church could not have so done.

We, however, would make a third suggestion. Why should not Ninian, bishop of the western shore of Britain, who had actually been consecrated in Rome, tell the Bishop of Rome of the fields whitening unto the harvest in Ireland? From his own monastery at Candida Casa it is possible that brethren had often gone to the land whose hills they could distinctly see across the strait. But Ninian could do little in that direction. It was a grand opportunity for the Church in imperial Rome, with her wealth and opportunities of many kinds, and the Bishop of Rome nobly seized it. All honor to him for his zeal and for the effort he made. Unfortunately his choice fell on the wrong man. Palladius was not a Columba nor a Boniface, nor even an Augus-

tine. He was not of the stuff of which missionaries are made. Founding no churches; converting no tribe, he soon left the missionary field. And so ended the only effort Rome ever made for the true evangelization of Ireland. When next she appeared it was very much in the spirit of Mohammed, whose alternative to the heretic was the Koran or the Sword; but not at all in the spirit of the Master who said: "My kingdom is not of this world."¹ "Put up thy sword into the sheath."²

Happily for Ireland, at the extreme edge of Ninian's diocese there lived in the old Roman town of Dumbarton, one Calpurnius, a deacon of the British Church, as well as an official of his native town. The wild Irish, sweeping up the Clyde on an occasion, seized and bore away to slavery in his sixteenth year, a son of this British clergyman, along with many others of the people. That was a sad day for Calpurnius and his wife, who tradition says was a sister of Martin of Tours. But God had work for their son to do. As he chose David, his servant, so he chose Patrick also, "and took him away from the sheep-folds: as he was following the ewes great with

¹ John xviii. 36.

² John xviii. 11.

young ones he took him; that he might feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance.”¹ After six years of life on the Irish hills, keeping sheep for a pagan master, he escaped to his own country. But he could not stay at home. As in the vision of the man of Macedonia, when St. Paul heard the summons to go across the blue Ægean, so Patrick in like manner heard a voice saying to him, “Come over and help us.” Making no delay, he sought and obtained ordination as his father had done before him; for those were days in the Church of God

“Long ere her churchmen, by bigotry,
Were barred from holy wedlock’s tie.”

Soon afterwards having been consecrated bishop to the Irish, he went back to the land of his captivity; and there in the same field and among the same people where Palladius, the Roman missionary, had so ignominiously failed, Patrick, the British bishop, achieved the most glorious success ever known to history since Apostolic days. Partly from others, partly from himself, as stated in those “Confessions” of his which remind us of the Confessions of Augustine, we know the story

¹ Ps. lxxviii. 70-71.

of his life; and very sweet and very beautiful it is. The strongest and yet gentlest of men, with the noblest, most devout and lovable of characters, he was the man whose love for souls has made for centuries past his name a household word in all western Christendom—a name that princes have loved to bear.

Modern Rome claims this man for her own—a man who was never in Rome in his life, who owes nothing to her, but who, on the contrary, was the child of the old British Church; baptized and catechized in the old Church of which his father was a deacon. Consecrated a bishop in the Gallic Church, a man who never mentions Rome, and whom Rome herself never mentions until long after his death, we justly ask on what ground or pretence the attempt is made to rob the British Church of the brightest jewel in her crown. His work began in 432. At his death all Ireland might have cried out as did Elisha, “My father, my father, the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof.”¹ Mainly to him was it due that, by the seventh century, Ireland was called the Isle of Saints, and that from that isle, long before the seventh century, missionaries went forth

¹ 2 Kings ii. 12.

to Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and even Britain; and that when no less a man than Gregory the Great, Bishop of Rome though he was, was ignorant of the Greek language,¹ the clergy of Ireland were reading the writings of the New Testament, not only in their own tongue in which they were born, but in the language in which the Apostles and Evangelists wrote them.²

Patrick, Rome's missionary to Ireland! Then how, may we ask, are we to explain these two facts: first, that Ireland was the very last country in Europe to submit to the papal claims, and then only at the point of the sword; secondly, that Downpatrick, the place of his burial, has not, instead of Armagh, been holy ground to the Roman Catholic? Not until the twelfth century did the Church of Patrick lose her independence; then the fate which had overtaken all western Churches overtook her. It happened thus:—Once, once only, in all the long history of the papacy, has there been an English Pope. Then was wrought the deed of shame. That English Pope plotted with the English King to rivet the papal chains upon her who had never been in bondage to any man. Adrian IV. (Nicholas Breakspear) was that

¹ See his Epistles, vii. 32; xi. 74.

² Killen, p. 51.

English Pope; Henry II. was that English King. Until then Ireland was free. Until then Ireland was utterly indifferent to the spiritual thunders of Rome. But this indifference could not be forever tolerated; and the Bishop of Rome sought at last the aid of England against Ireland, very much as at a later day, he sought that of Spain against England herself. Henry was called upon by the Pope to invade Ireland. Poor man! How one sin leads on to another. Two years before, having murdered Becket for fighting the Pope's battle,—a deed of blood that cost him his independence, and at which all Europe stood aghast,—he bared his back in penance to the lash. The invasion of a free country at the bidding of his Roman master was part of the expiation of his crime.

The result of the invasion was far-reaching. It lasts to this day. It is more than seven centuries since, yet to-day Ireland is England's chastisement. At the sacred Rock of Cashel,¹ in 1172, when three thousand bishops and clergy were assembled, Henry was accepted as the Sovereign Lord of Ireland; then for the first time in her history Ireland's Church bowed down as vassal

¹ Wordsworth's *Church of Ireland*, p. 185.

of the Pope. The very Rock itself might have cried out. What a contrast! oh, what a contrast! to that striking scene at Runnymede in 1215, when the archbishops, bishops, barons, and people of England would have none of it, and when the air was laden with the shouts of those who declared, in the words of the Great Charter, "The English Church shall be free!"¹ In Ireland, alas, how different! "How are the mighty fallen, and the weapons of war perished!"²

In 1536 the Bishop of Rome was declared to have no rightful jurisdiction in Ireland; but accepting not the judgment of the national Church, he established in 1565 the present Italian Mission there.

The spiritual invasion of Ireland by the Bishop of Rome is indeed the more inexcusable, because there has never been any pretence that Ireland has not always possessed a valid Episcopate. We hear of no Nag's Head Fable there. The line of the Irish Bishops has been,

"Like the bright flame that shone in Kildare's holy fane
And burned long ages through darkness and storm."

But yet unlike that sacred fire of the Nun of Kildare, it has never failed.

¹ Magna Charta, Sec. i., "*quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit.*"

² 2 Samuel i. 27.

We do not, however, speak in parables when we say that the weak spot of Ireland's Church in time past has been her Episcopate. To those who know the power of efficient organization and proper concentration of forces, and are familiar with the history of Ireland, it will not seem strange that the old Celtic Church was thus, on her own soil and among her own people, ousted from her rightful place. She had no organization. Her inherited constitution was against her. Pastors she had in abundance and bishops by the hundred; but she had neither Parishes nor Dioceses.¹ Her Clergy were as so many wandering stars. When John Wesley, defying all parochial order, replied to his bishop's admonition that all the world was his parish, and he would preach where, and when, and how he pleased, he was but following the worst feature in the life of the old Celtic Church in Ireland. The bishops of that Church claimed the like privilege. Living in monastic establishments they issued forth like soldiers from a fortress to carry on a guerilla warfare. Without definite plans, and without harmonious arrangement, they attempted to do the work of evangelists and so build up a Church in Ireland.

¹ Wordsworth's Church of Ireland, p. 27.

Who can wonder that a system like this broke down before the onward march of a Church which had inherited the genius of imperial Rome for organization, and well understood the value of orderly and methodical work?

To-day this old Church is weak and impotent from another cause, one of her bishops, the Bishop of Derry, perhaps the ablest, the most eloquent, the best theologian of them all, being the judge: "The prospect," said this bishop, in his address to the Diocesan Synod of Derry and Raphoe, October 21, 1890, "is gloomy. It is our sad lot to live in a land of ruins. The ashes of the furnace of disestablishment sprinkled towards heaven in 1869 have become the small dust of Communism in all the land." The Church has been losing ground. And he gives the reason: "We have had for long generations, so far as externals were concerned, bald services and ugly churches;" speak if you will of High Church or Low Church. There is a standard of service and a measure of ritual laid down in our service books; that service and that ritual are full of innate dignity and beauty. Neglect these things, be untrue to them, and a Church will fall behind and wither away!

Would that the Churches in Britain could come to the help of the Church of Ireland; could come there to the help of the Lord; to the help of the Lord against the mighty. For the Churches in Britain have owed, and yet owe much to that Church of Ireland: "She has done great things for them; yea, she hath done great things for them already, whereof they rejoice."¹ True, they gave Patrick to Ireland, but that fact ought now to be their chief incentive; for was there ever a gift more bountifully repaid, ever a more beautiful exhibition of the Preacher's words, "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days."² The gift of Patrick was like that gift of mercy, which blesseth him that gives and him that takes. It was to Britain in Britain's own hour of need, nearly a century after Patrick's death, that the great Columba came; and in the original home of Patrick, and all along that western shore, the Irish Apostle's son in the faith labored on, building churches, establishing missions, converting the heathen, until all through those parts a flourishing Church was again seen. England, too, shared the fruit of Columba's labors. When in South Britain the heathen swept

¹ Ps. cxxvi. 3, 4.

² Eccl. xi. 1.

Christianity from the land, it was from the Irish missionary stations that men went forth into Northumbria to preach Christ to the heathen there! Thus Aidan and Finan and their successors rekindled the light which had been quenched, and which, thus rekindled, has never ceased to shine brightly, and shall shine, as we earnestly believe, until the day star from on high, before which all other lights will "begin to pale their ineffectual fires," shall rise forevermore.

To Ireland's Church, as a Church, we of America owe nothing; but to her sons we have owed much. It is from that Church that some of our present most gifted bishops have come. Let one of these tell us of his love for the Church of his early life which yet abides, while he guides a diocese in the land of his adoption; as loyal a churchman and as true a citizen as ever any born on our own soil. He is but the type of his brethren, when he says:¹ "It is more than half a century since that, as a child, I stood clasping my father's hand, upon the deck of a ship which, drifting down the Lough, was bearing me to the land I love with every pulse of my heart—the

¹ Sermon by Hugh Miller Thompson, Bishop of Mississippi, in Cork Cathedral, vide *Canadian Church Guardian*, 1888.

United States of America. And yet in all these years I have never ceased to love the land of my birth, have never ceased to feel a pride that I am an Ulster man, a Derry man; have never ceased to be thankful that I was baptized and catechized in the old Church of Ireland, the Church of St. Patrick and Columbkille. And as the vision of 'Derry's sunlit spire' was the last I remember as a child of the home I was leaving, so I hailed it the other day, across the silvery Foyle as symbol, on its rock-founded and rock-girded hill, of that unchangeable Church which, in all the shocks of time and change, remains the same, and which lifts, as your fair Cathedral lifts, its gleaming cross aloft, to point our souls to the unchanging heaven, our fatherland and home."

VII.

THE DIVINE CONSTITUTION OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH

VII.

THE DIVINE CONSTITUTION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

“Our Constitution had begun to exist in times when statesmen were not much accustomed to frame exact definitions.”

—MACAULAY.

WITHOUT a constitution, no nation, no state, no society, no organized body of men can exist at all. Its supreme importance is aptly witnessed to by our ordinary phraseology. By an easy transfer of ideas, we do not hesitate to speak of the aggregate of our vital powers as our physical constitution. Now, what that is to a man we well know. It is peace of mind and ease of body; it is success; it is happiness; it is life itself. Similarly the Church of Christ has a constitution, which is to her all that such can ever be to the state it creates and by which it is created. But with this difference: That of the Church is divine; the hand of man may not touch it: whereas that of

the State is but human, and may at any time be amended, changed, or even ended. In this respect there is a chasm, deep and wide as the ocean, between the Church of Christ and every other organized body in the world.

Now, a nation's constitution is generally stated in language so clear, that "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."¹ Such, *e.g.*, is the Constitution of the United States of America; for it is reasonably brief and it is reasonably clear. We once heard a distinguished judge, addressing a body of law students, say that they could read it through while they were discussing the last game of base-ball. On the other hand it might have been neither clear nor brief, nor even written at all. Partly enshrined in unwritten customs and time-worn traditions, partly in the historical records of a distant past, partly contained in supplementary Statutes and Ordinances of modern legislation, we do not infrequently find a country's Constitution. Such is that *e.g.*, of England: "Our Constitution," said Macaulay, "had begun to exist in times when statesmen were not much accustomed to frame exact definitions." Had he spoken this word of

¹ Isaiah xxxv. 8.

the Church and not of the State, it would have been equally true. The New Testament proves this. There we find nothing like a formal statement constituting the Christian Church, clearly defining and determining the conditions of her being; nothing like that clear word of ancient days when God "gave Israel a law; which he commanded our forefathers to teach their children; that their posterity might know it: and the children which were yet unborn: To the intent that when they came up: they might show their children the same."¹ There is nothing in the New Testament at all approaching an exact definition of the essentials of the Church: and yet it would be an error to suppose that there is nothing of that nature to be found in its pages, which is the Last Source of all our knowledge of things spiritual! On the contrary, a Constitution is there enshrined so closely illustrated in all the workings of the history of that period, that even were we without the New Testament, we could still show from the records of Apostolic life what was the original Constitution of the Apostolic Church! For us those Scriptures will ever contain all things necessary to be believed.

¹ Ps. lxxviii. 5, 6.

They are that Word of God of which it is declared that while "the grass withereth and the flower fadeth, the word of our God shall stand forever."¹

The great Bishop Butler has told us that "a man may lose his limbs, his organs of sense, and even the greater part of his body, and yet remain the same living agent."² These things are in reality no part of a man's true self, and their removal is not, therefore, the dissolution of the living agent. In a similar manner much, perhaps, of what we have been apt to think of as the Church's true self may be removed, and no dissolution will follow. But remove essential things and the Church ceases to be. Our present inquiry is as to what these *essential* things are.

The Church is literally God's kingdom on earth. Jesus Christ, *both* God and Man, is its King. Any other that in this kingdom maketh himself a king or potentate, speaketh against Christ, who alone is rightfully Lord of all. His kingdom was founded and absolutely exists for certain definite and well understood objects. It is itself a distinct creation in the world, yet "not of this world." Membership therein is obtained

¹ Isaiah xl. 7.

² The Analogy of Religion, Part I. Chap. I.

in a particular way, good standing maintained in another way, while its affairs are administered by officials whose duties and powers are created and defined by the original constitution itself. The general arrangement of the Church, in fact, reminds us of a well-planned and carefully ordered civil government, whether monarchy or republic makes no real difference.

Let us speak, first, of the officials. They are analogous to the magistrates in a civil commonwealth and are, and always have been, of three ranks or orders. "It is evident unto all men," the Prayer Book says, "diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of ministers in Christ's Church,—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."¹ Please observe that the appeal is to history; not to dogmas of the school, nor to degrees of council, but to *history*.

The lowest Order is that of Deacons. These were at first appointed to assist the higher officers in their secular and routine business, so as to leave them at liberty to attend to the weightier matters of the law.² But it is clear that they were

¹ Prayer Book, Preface to Ordination Services, p. 509.

² Acts vi. 1 to 6.

also empowered to help them in their more religious and sacred work.¹ The first deacons preached and baptized; as did S. Philip, with signal success, in Samaria.² At the present day a deacon is commonly one looking forward to be called unto the higher ministries in the Church. The Church, indeed, exhorts him so to use his office that he may be found worthy of this advancement.³ Meanwhile, what his duties are we have been told by good George Herbert in his own inimitable and quaint way. The Deacon :

“ He’s purposely ordain’d to minister,
In sacred things, to another officer.”

The second Order is that of Presbyters or Priests, the name matters not :

“ For Priest is but Presbyter writ short.”

For brevity’s sake, ay, and for another reason too, we will give him the shorter name :

“ The Priest, I say, the Presbyter, I mean,
As nowadays he’s called
By many men ; but I choose to retain

¹ Acts vi. 7 to 15.

² Acts viii. 5 to 40.

³ Prayer Book, p. 513, Collect.

The name wherewith install'd—
He was at first in our own mother tongue,
And doing so, I hope, I do no wrong."

It is of these officers that S. Paul, writing to Timothy, says: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine."¹ We often find mention made in Scripture of these elders, or priests as we now call them, but never under more touching circumstances than when those who were in charge of the churches of Ephesus met S. Paul at Miletus and sadly took their last farewell, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more.² The special work of these, as men wholly consecrated to God, is the care of souls; the administration of public worship and of the sacraments; the preaching of God's Word; the visitation of the sick, and the due exercise of discipline over the flocks committed to them.

The highest in rank is the bishop. To some it is doubtful what this office is. Their difficulty arises from the fact that at first these officials bear other titles. Not seldom are they

¹ 1 Tim. v. 17.

² Acts xx. 17 to 38.

styled Apostles, sometimes Angels, as S. John terms them in the Apocalypse when speaking of the seven churches of Asia Minor ; sometimes by the name they now universally bear ; but what matters it ? Overseers of their brethren were they always, and true magistrates of the Church of God, to whom was committed the oversight and general government of the Christian Church ; officers divinely appointed, through human agencies, to commission their successors from and by the Holy Ghost forever, and to order every sacred function which belongs to the Church Militant in all its fulness till time shall be no more.

The ceremony by which one becomes a member of this kingdom is known as baptism. As natural birth put us into the visible world, so Christian baptism put us into the spiritual world. By the washing of water in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost we are made members of this Church, children of God, and inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven presumptively hereafter. Without doubt, and without delay, and, so far as we *know*, never in any other way, are we admitted to this spiritual citizenship and all its attendant blessings.

Many find this teaching a stumbling-block. They cannot understand how so much can depend upon so "little." Perhaps the difficulty originates in the thought that baptism is little. But nothing connected with the worship of God is little. Moreover, whatever baptism intrinsically may be, its observance is absolutely bound up with the alternatives of obedience or disobedience to the plain command of our King. He has *commanded* His servants to go into all the world and baptize every creature; which is surely not less a command to every creature to be baptized than it is to them to baptize. But no Christ-given ceremony can ever be a small and unimportant matter. Yet if it were, "Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!"¹ The spark which became the great fire of Chicago might once have been quenched by a mere child with a jug of water in his hand. So, too, the birth of an infant child is but in itself a trifling event when it is over; yet upon it altogether depends the whole future life of that child. Now, baptism is like that birth: for baptism is spiritual birth!

It is, at all events, an indication of the importance the Church assigns to baptism, that she pro-

¹ James iii. 5.

vides for its administration no less than three forms of service :

1.—For infants who soon after birth are, and should be, brought to the Church ;

2.—For those who are in danger of death and cannot be taken out of their houses ;

3.—For adults whose baptism has been hitherto neglected or deferred.

But, admitting the duty of those who have come to years of discretion to be baptized, why baptize in infancy ? We answer that not one only, but several considerations, have led the Church to baptize the lambs of the flock.

She remembers, first of all, that baptism corresponds to circumcision, which was administered to infants of only eight days old, and that neglect of that ordinance was severely punished¹ under Hebraic law.

In the next place, she remembers that the charge to baptize every creature was given even to Jews. Now can anyone doubt how such Jews as SS. Peter and Paul and James would interpret this command, accustomed as they had ever been to see children of the tenderest age admitted into covenant relationship with God under the old

¹ Exodus ix. 24.

dispensation? Would they have been likely to refuse baptism to the tenderest infant? Had they been disposed to do so, what objection would they have offered? If any, under what authority? Had not Christ said expressly, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not?"¹ Had not this settled it to their Jewish minds?

Furthermore can anyone, studying the New Testament diligently, fail to acknowledge that it is more probable than not that children were actually baptized by the Apostles, since whole households were baptized by them at one time; and especially so since on the day of Pentecost, they expressly taught that the promises of the Gospel were to the children also, "to you and your children."²

Again, there is in evidence the nature of baptism itself. If, as Christ said, it be so that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,"³ then baptism is indeed a new birth—a birth into that kingdom, which is the Church of God militant here on earth. And why, since infants are but passive recipients of natural birth, life, and sustenance, and

¹ Mark x. 14.

² Acts ii. 39.

³ John iii. 5.

their early unconsciousness is admittedly no bar to their immediately inheriting property or receiving gifts, must a spiritual birth alone be dependent upon consciousness and intelligence? We confidently await a satisfactory answer to this question, as even to what is utterly unanswerable.

For these reasons the Church from the beginning has ever baptized infants. By this baptism these little ones are made God's children, not Methodists or Baptists, Presbyterians or Congregationalists, not even Episcopalians; but they are made Christians—children of the Catholic Church of Christ, and the Catholic Church is thus coextensive with all who are rightly baptized.

Next to baptism comes confirmation—in a certain sense a part of baptism. Through the absence of bishops, for years and years it was never administered in America. The advent of apostolic bishops here was followed by a series of confirmation services, almost Pentecostal in their fervor and in the greatness of their results. In the denominational bodies it remains not yet administered. Through the same lack of Officers which once prevented its administration in the old Church of the land, these newer Christian

communities are unwillingly obliged to dispense with it now. Confirmation is, in fact, still called in some places "Bishop's Baptism." It is the complement and fulfilment of baptism. Its chief idea is that something already in existence needs strengthening. It is a buttress built to support a wall already standing; armor given to a soldier already enlisted. In the words of an old Prayer-Book,¹ "Confirmation is ministered to them that be baptized, that by imposition of hands and prayer, they may receive strength and defence against all temptation to sin and the assaults of the world and the devil."

This is all clear enough, and yet often mistaken are some of the most loyal of the Church's children about the meaning of this service. It is often regarded as the formal and public "joining the Church." How strange that such an idea should become so prevalent. One cannot join that of which one is already a member, and by baptism we were made members of the Church once for all. It is thus an error to speak of "joining the Church" at confirmation; so also is it an error to think of it as simply taking vows upon ourselves once made for us by others. The adult

¹ The Prayer-Book of 1549.

candidate for baptism answers for himself at his baptism, and yet he must be and is confirmed all the same ; just as the twelve men at Ephesus were confirmed by S. Paul, who had a little while before been baptized by him. Baptism waits for its full completion, and for the more abundant outpouring of the Holy Spirit, at confirmation, when we are admitted to the fullest membership, and share in all the privileges of the divinely constituted Church of Christ.

Baptized, and then confirmed, the citizen of the great Christian Republic can at once claim its greatest blessings. He is then called, indeed, to true Holy Communion. But even here there is no mere badge of membership, nor yet even the only act of worship provided by the constitution of the Church, but in truth a chosen means of maintaining healthy, spiritual life. "This do," said our King, "in remembrance of Me."¹ "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."²

Alas, that there should ever have been any misunderstanding about statements so plain, and a service so solemn. Yet there have been misunderstandings from the first : "How can this man

¹ Luke xxii. 19.

² John vi. 55.

give us his flesh to eat?"¹ incredulously asked the men who first heard the words, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life."² And still men continue to ask the question. But is it really necessary that they should know, necessary even that they should all attach one and the same meaning to those solemn words? Is not simple, unquestioning obedience to the King's command sufficient? It is indeed requisite to see that we have something here altogether holy, which must be treated with all due reverence; but is there need of more? May we not, with Queen Elizabeth, say:

"Christ took the bread and brake it;
He was the Word that spake it;
And what that Word doth make it,
That I believe, and take it."

Yet all knowledge is not denied. Much we can know, and all we rightly can, we should know. Knowledge is always power; power here to love God better and better; power to find truer joy and peace in believing; and power to find more and more grace to help us in time of need.

The Holy Communion is the continual plead

¹ John vi. 52.

² John vi. 54.

ing before God of the one perfect sacrifice of the Son of God. That full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and oblation for the sins of the whole world, can never be repeated. But when we enter God's House to show, in Christ's own way, Christ's death till He come, we as it were plead that sacrifice again, and put God again in mind of it; we claim in it the sole merits of Christ our shield, so that all through its solemn celebration we seem to be saying: "Jesus died for me: between my sins and their deservings I put his cross and passion."

Let us here note that the distinction sometimes drawn between the Jewish priests and Christian priests, as if the former were sacrificing priests and the latter not, is misleading. "A little knowledge is a dangerous thing." The Jewish priests were sacrificing priests only in the sense that Christian priests are. Jewish sacrifices found their efficacy only at Calvary, and apart from the sacrifice on the Cross they were "lighter than vanity itself." It was of these very sacrifices that S. Paul declared: "Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins." ¹

¹ Heb. x. 11.

“ Not all the blood of beasts,
On Jewish altars slain,
Could give the guilty conscience peace,
Or wash away the stain.”

There is indeed one difference between ours and theirs, but it is not important. It is this: theirs looked forward; ours, backward. Theirs were for the most part accompanied by the shedding of blood; ours altogether without, “ours is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—of soul and body.” But in the thing itself, in all the essentials of the service, in the root idea of sacrifice, Jewish and Christian sacrifices were the same. Hence S. Paul says: “We have an altar.”¹ So, too, have we priests, modelled after the pattern of him who was the only true Sacrificing Priest there has ever been—that Holy One, who, having made, by one oblation once offered, one full perfect and sufficient sacrifice for sins, sat down forever at the right hand of God.

Now, what is the *raison d'être* of all this? What is the Church's “mission?” We briefly answer: The salvation of men. This is not, however, as some think, a future but a present work. Without salvation here and now, there can be no sal-

¹ Heb. xiii. 10.

vation hereafter. Yet salvation is not of the Church. The Church is a created thing and salvation must come from God.

“ Christ is made the sure salvation,
Christ, the head and corner-stone.”

“ For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.”¹ Yet the Church bears a part in a work so glorious. Her mission—her primary mission—is to reveal and preserve the truth. For this she existed in Jewish days; for this she was re-created by Christ and received a new commission. What S. John says of his own Gospel is true of all Scripture, old and new. “ These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name.”² The manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is the central essence of the scriptural revelation.

The Church is the divinely appointed guardian of the truth; with the Apostles' Creed for her constitution. The articles of that creed are as the keystones to her arches “ built upon the foun-

¹ Acts iv. 12.

² John xx. 31.

dation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone.”¹

We have thus laid bare the framework of the Church. By another metaphor this framework supports what is sometimes termed the platform of the Church. The kingship of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the two Sacraments, the Creeds, the Apostolic Ministry, constitute this framework and platform. Here we have “the faith once delivered to the saints.”

If it be pointed out that in this “framework” or “platform” no mention is made of confirmation, nor yet of the orders of deacon and priest, which we have spoken of as a necessary part of the divine Constitution, we reply that confirmation is but a part of baptism, and that the lower orders of the ministry are involved in the higher. The episcopate is at once the fountain and the river of the ministry, the priesthood and the diaconate are as tributary rivulets inflowing from the common source. The less is contained in the greater, and that greater is the historic episcopate with its Head enthroned in heaven:—that great Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, under whose unsleeping Episcopate the Church is accomplishing her work!

¹ Eph. ii. 20.

VIII.

THE HUMAN ORGANIZATION OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA

VIII.

THE HUMAN ORGANIZATION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN AMERICA

"The heavens themselves, the planets and this centre
Observe degree, priority and space."

—SHAKESPEARE: "Troilus and Cressida,"
Act I., Sc. 3.

EIGHTEEN centuries have left their mark upon the Church's framework, and to-day she stands forth a kingdom not of this world, yet a kingdom highly organized. Her organization is, of course, something entirely different from her Constitution. That is unalterable. "No decree nor statute which the King establisheth may be changed."¹ But it is not so with her temporal organization. That can be changed, for it is merely the machinery with which she does her work. Indeed, it is an indispensable mark of a true national Church that she can at any time adapt her methods to the ever-changing demands

¹ Daniel vi. 15.

of the age. "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, or abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."¹

It is of this temporal organization that we now speak. But temporal though it be, its importance is confessedly great. Bible, sacraments, and officers there might be; but if the Church possessed no organization, she would be very much in the position of a body of citizens without discipline or military training marching against a well-drilled enemy. However well accoutred, well officered, patriotic in spirit, and united in purpose those citizens might be, they could never contend successfully against well-trained invaders. Even numbers, strength, integrity of purpose, and righteousness of cause would not atone for such lack of order and method. Hence the value and need of organization. With this, then, are we now only concerned. We are thinking, to use Bishop Butler's simile, not about what constitutes the man, the living agent, but about those organs of sense and movement which mean so much to a man, but yet are no essential parts

¹ Art. of Religion XXXIV.

of him. Our inquiry will thus be seen to be not about the being, the *esse*, but about the well-being, the *bene esse*, of the Church.

We do well to speak on this subject, since there is not merely no little confusion but that also where we should least expect it. Among even Church people some do not seem to understand that, while such things as baptism, holy communion, bishops, belong essentially to the Church's constitution, dioceses, archbishops, rectors, vestries, and the like belong to her temporal organization only, and that these latter—name and thing—may be dispensed with, and the Church still be here. Poorer without them she would be, like a soldier suddenly deprived in the midst of battle of his ordinary weapons; or like an artisan, deprived of his tools and reduced to use only his mere hands; yet she would still be the Church, and her authority, inalienable rights, and divine constitution would remain untouched.

The first temporal feature of the Church we will now consider is the parish. Historically, save in name, it had not any pre-eminence. The diocese, once so-called, was first; but as the parish is the channel through which all our knowledge of the Church is now usually attained,

we give it precedence. What, then, is a parish? We once knew a country rector who, on resigning his charge, handed it over to his successor along with his horse and carriage, and well-furnished rectory. His children, not entirely appreciating the situation, were at a loss to know why their father had given up everything to the stranger, and their little minds were somewhat troubled. But what puzzled them most of all was this very word parish. Their father had given up that. But what was that? It wasn't a horse, it wasn't a garden, it was not a house—then what was it? They could not tell. We fear that they did not stand alone in their difficulty. Well, then, a parish is a territorial district specifically assigned to a minister's spiritual care. Beyond the bounds of this limited district he has no individual jurisdiction. Outside of it he cannot claim *as a right* to hold a single religious service nor do any ecclesiastical work. Do we ask why this exclusive authority on the one hand, and its curious limitation on the other? The Church, like her Master, gives to every man his own special work, and just as Nature abhors a vacuum, so she abhors divided responsibility. She gives to each one his definite place and defi-

nite work, and makes him specially responsible for his part of the vineyard.

Every parish is governed by a vestry. This body, consisting of the rector, and a fixed number of his lay parishioners, has come to possess very considerable powers. Its members are usually charged with the care of their local church affairs and all its property. When a legal corporation (as is commonly the case), their lawfully official acts are held to be binding upon such corporation. Their duties are many, but their most important duty, from every point of view, is in the selection of a clergyman to be the rector of their parish and the head of their own body, whenever there is a vacancy. The vestry, however, is seldom a close corporation: its members are not autocrats. They are usually elected annually by the Parishioners; and once a year, at or about Easter, at least half of them must retire voluntarily, or be voted out of the vestry itself, even if, as often happens, the parishioners immediately vote them in again.

Very interesting is it here to note, that our American system of Church appointments is practically a modern application of a custom which is not only at once the most extensive and

the most ancient of all forms of such appointments in England, but is, of all others, that one which is thought, and rightly thought, to be utterly out of harmony with nineteenth century ideas and progress. We mean what is known as private "patronage." To American Churchmen it is theoretically incomprehensible that any one man should have the power or, even if legally possessed of it, be willing to exercise the right, of autocratically choosing a clergyman on his own responsibility for a whole congregation. Yet the origin of the right was both natural and simple. For this, however, we must look far back to the days of early Saxon Christianity. At that time, throughout immense tracts, there were no actually resident clergy. It was the era of missionary work; not yet the era of settled and parochial activity. All offerings were paid into a central fund administered by the bishop, the clergy lived for the most part in monastic communities, and there was no ready supply of local needs. It was not at all a satisfactory plan, and we owe its abolition to Archbishop Theodore, the first Primate of all England. That Archbishop sought to map out England into distinct parishes, and to provide a local pastor for every parish; and for

this he laid foundations like a wise master-builder. He urged the local land-owners to contribute to special funds for the settling of a resident pastor there among them. He yet further encouraged "the rich in this world to be ready to give and glad to contribute," by causing a national law to be enacted that any one who should build a Church and make permanent provision for a local priest, should have the privilege of selecting that priest; the same privilege to descend to his heirs after him.

This plan so far succeeded that endowments and private patrons came in together on the flood-tide, until to-day there are 6,500 such Parishes out of a grand total of 21,400 in all England. This system in the past worked great good, untold good, and it has not been the least of the blessings the first Primate of all England bequeathed to the national Church of his adopted land. It has still its advantages, but it is now too manifestly out of harmony with present thought to be seriously defended. To us, however, it is chiefly interesting as containing the germ of our own plan of filling vacant parishes. In America our vestries continue to select the rectors, as we have said, yet only on behalf of

the parishioners, as their deputies and in their names; and these parishioners not unnaturally think that, since they have built a Church and made provision for a rector, they may, subject to the bishop's approval, rightly make their own selection of him from the ranks of the clergy.

Wheresoever the Church exists she is usually divided into dioceses: "Ecclesiastical divisions" these "of any kingdom or state, subject to the authority of a bishop," who is entrusted with the spiritual supervision of all the churches within the limits of his diocese or division. From the fact that each bishop used to have his "cathedra," or chair, in some leading church of his diocese, such church is for that reason most commonly called the cathedral, and not infrequently "the Bishop's Church." But in a very real sense all the churches within his diocese may be so called, since daily upon him, as once upon S. Paul, comes the care of them all.

A bishop has no local jurisdiction outside of his own diocese; any more than has a priest outside of his own parish,—but within it he is supreme. Unlike the priest, he has no ecclesiastical superior. Nevertheless he is bishop to his

diocese merely. There is nothing new in this territorial limitation of his powers. Thus was S. James, Bishop of Jerusalem. Thus, too, was Timothy, Bishop of Ephesus; and Titus, Bishop of Crete. Yet at first, this custom was not universal. The Celtic Church, which established Christianity in Ireland and Scotland, and from which our own is in part descended, knew no such custom. Instead of a diocesan episcopacy, that Church had, as we have already said, a system by which bishops and clergy lived in communities as head-quarters of a common work, from whence they literally went everywhere preaching the word. The so-called episcopate in the Methodist Episcopal Church is organized apparently much upon the same plan. Without a territorial diocese, or any local responsibility, these Methodist "bishops" seem to be some counterpart of the old Celtic bishops, yet lacking the essential apostolic succession. It is in the Holy Catholic Church that to-day diocesan episcopacy alone exists.¹ There are, it is true, many bishops in our own church no longer ruling over

¹ We are not unaware of the Roman practice of making bishops without *actual* Dioceses, but even in their case the theory is that each has a diocese somewhere; *e.g.*, Archbishop Satolli is *styled* the Bishop of Lepanto.

dioceses, commonly those who through sickness or age have resigned them; but they are bishops still—once a bishop, always a bishop. They are as retired colonels without regiments; retired captains without ships. Their orders are still valid, their record is still honorable, their title untouched, their inherent powers what they ever were; but yet they may no more claim to exercise their powers in another bishop's diocese than a retired sea captain can claim the right to command the particular ship in which he may happen to be travelling. Thus they are bishops without bishoprics, yet bishops still, and such they will be until death.

A diocese, which is thus the sphere and area of a single bishop's work, may embrace a continent, or may be as small as some islet of the sea. In the United States this disparity in size is perhaps more observable than anywhere else; still, by canon law "no new Diocese can be formed here which shall contain less than six Parishes or less than six Presbyters."¹ There is, however, no legislative limit in the other direction. The Diocese of New York contained in 1894 366 Clergy; it might conceivably contain 1,000.

¹ Const., p. 3.

In England and her Colonies there is no limit at all. The Island of St. Helena has but three Clergy under the bishop of "the smallest Diocese in the world."

The diocese is a complete and integral part of the Church of Christ. In America we have over seventy, and these so entirely cover the face of the country that there is no portion of it not under the care of a bishop. Everywhere the Church has gone, to the full measure of her ability, forming her dioceses, placing her bishops and building her churches, and tendering the blessings of the Gospel to all. Her offers may be indeed rejected as involving the unpardonable assumption that she is *the* Church, yet she is there for all who will receive her, seeking, however feebly, to emulate the great Father Himself, "for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." ¹

The diocese is governed by a council.² This is a body somewhat analogous to the vestry. It meets usually but once a year, its members being composed of the bishop, the clergy, and certain laymen chosen by their respective parishes, one for every clergyman. The bishop

¹ Matt. v. 45.

² Or convention.

always presides. The objects of the council have in part been so clearly stated by the present Bishop of Fond du Lac that we do not hesitate to use his language. Its members "assemble first of all, to offer up high praise and Eucharist to God for His manifold blessings vouchsafed to them, and to beseech His Majesty for some further largeness of His bounty, some charismata of His gifts of grace. It is, therefore, with special solemnity and careful ceremonial and musical accompaniment we celebrate the divine mysteries. The conciliar celebration is not therefore to be regarded as a mere appropriate opening religious service to the more important business exercises. It is one of the chief purposes of our assembling. It is one of the highest works of the council. It is the coming together of all the presbytery and representative laymen to make their united solemn Eucharistic offering to Almighty God." ¹

The more practical duties of the Council are the framing of the canons and laws, and the taking of measures for the general welfare of all the churches and of all the souls within the diocesan limits. Its goal is the filling of the Father's house with those who are yet in the streets of the city,

¹ Charge of Bishop Grafton, 1894.

and in the lanes and highways of the great world around. It stands for all organized effort of the Church over that special part of the vineyard.

Where dioceses are so large as to render some intermediate organization necessary between the diocese and the parish, the necessary link has, of late years, been often supplied by what are called indifferently deaneries, archdeaconries, and convocations, a different nomenclature obtaining in different places for the same thing. Thus what is a Convocation in Pennsylvania and a Deanery in Western New York, with a dean as its head in each case, is in New York City and Diocese an Archdeaconry, with an archdeacon as its head. It is the same in Maryland.

The terms Rural Dean and Archdeacon, which have reference to these intermediate forms of organization, are somewhat similar to those of canon, rector, and the like. They do not, that is, indicate the existence of another order in the ministry; the divine constitution of the Church knowing only bishops, priests, and deacons. They are but officers for the better administration of the local affairs of the Church, admission to their office being not by ordination, but by

simple appointment of the bishop or some properly organized and representative ecclesiastical body ; they are parts, that is, of the organization of the diocese. Their special task is the caring for the missionary work within diocesan limits, and in this they have abundantly justified their existence.

Although such officers are somewhat new in the American Church, they are by no means new in the Church at large. Athanasius won his fame not as Patriarch, but as Archdeacon of Alexandria. They have existed, too, for ages in the Church of England ; but if one may credit the story oft told of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, that being on one occasion asked what an archdeacon's duties were, he humorously replied " That they were to perform archdiaconal functions," it would seem as if these venerable officials were at times like what a coat of paint would be on the exterior of a magnificent Gothic Cathedral, if it be possible to imagine such a thing.

In this country, however, they have been assigned definite duties, with altogether encouraging results. The Bishop of New York, in speaking at the one hundred and tenth¹ Convocation

¹ September 27, 1893.

of his diocese, on the Canon creating archdeacons some ten years before, said that at the time but little or nothing was expected from it by many. It was regarded as an archaic mechanism, foreign, superannuated, and rather unduly pretentious. "But," he went on to say, "I am persuaded that by this time such persons are, most of them, of another mind. No one who has acquainted himself with it can be insensible to the greatly increased efficiency of our missionary work all over the Diocese, as witnessed increasingly by its fruit. That this is due first to the fidelity of our missionaries, and of loyal laymen and women who labor with them, there can be little doubt; but that these labors have been guided, encouraged, economized, and in every way wisely administered, with most important and inspiring results, by my dear brethren, the Archdeacons of the Diocese—of this there can be no doubt at all. They have strengthened the hands of every missionary; they have cheered the hearts of the lonely and struggling lay people; they have seized opportunities, and laid foundations, and filled vacancies, and found fellow-workers; they have checked wastefulness and economized men and means; they have lifted the standard of discipline, and widened

the reach of the Church's work and influence in ways which it now has come to pass that all men know and own." Evidently, archdeacons have here more than justified their existence, and some future Primate of America will not have the knotty problem to solve which tried the wit of his Grace of Canterbury.

When a group of Dioceses are allied together a PROVINCE is formed; this being simply an aggregate of Dioceses for legislative purposes within the limits of a National Church. The chief bishop of every Province is generally styled Archbishop and Primate, or simply Primus. Of these Provinces there are several in the Anglo-Catholic Church. England contains two, those of Canterbury and York; Ireland two, Armagh and Dublin; Canada two, Canada and Rupert's Land. It is proposed to create similar Provinces in Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India, with Archbishops at Sydney, Cape Town, and Calcutta, and possibly also at Melbourne and Brisbane. The American Church has, properly speaking, no Provinces. But in this matter she too seems to be moving in the same direction as her sister Churches. "It is significant," wrote the late Dr. John Cotton Smith, "that there has been

a gradual movement in the Church which has in it the germs of the provincial system."

If needed anywhere in the whole world, the provincial system is certainly needed in America. The two Provinces of the Canadian Church, only consolidated in 1893, contain, the one but nine, the other but seven, dioceses. Even the Province of Canterbury, the premier province of the Anglican Church, contains but twenty-three; yet the jurisdiction of the American Church, covering a continent larger than Europe, has no Provinces at all!

This grouping together of contiguous dioceses which shall not be too large for common effective legislation, has therefore now become one of our greatest needs. So vast, indeed, is the area of this Church's operations that if relief be not afforded there is some danger of the net breaking. As matters stand, bishops on the Pacific slope are too far from their brother bishops on the Atlantic seaboard for any common legislation to be equally helpful. It would, of course, be different in a Church which had but half a dozen bishops, but in one which possesses fourscore, the Province must come if the government of the Church is to be anything more than a name.

And if this be the case now, what will it be

fifty years hence? We can but prophesy, though not altogether blindly. A moment's consideration will show that if the future growth of this Church shall be as its past, then something akin to our civil organization must be the result. As well might American citizens attempt to dispense with the system of Statehood as for the Church to dispense with the Province. Just think what, in half a century, say, Texas will be? That State has now 265,780 square miles of territory ; more than all the New England Dioceses, combined together, contain many times over. It is safe to say that before that time she will have been divided into several Dioceses. But Texas stands not alone. Growth is universal. The Church cannot, therefore, long postpone action if she would ; and it may be that, ere the first quarter of the twentieth century has run its course, the Bishops of such cities as Boston, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, and New Orleans, will attend that Conference as Metropolitans of the American Church, with a Primate of all America at their head, all looking to Canterbury as their Patriarchal See, and bound to it, not by the iron chains of Ultramontaniam, but by the golden links of freedom and affection.

Nor is all this tending toward the establishment of a head after the model of Rome. The Primate of the Anglican Communion claims no such dangerous pre-eminence. His type is not the Czar of all the Russias, but the head of a Constitutional Government. For us the true head is Christ alone. We need not be afraid, therefore, of such titles as Archbishop, or Primate. They merely indicate chiefs among equals. They who are ex-officio the chairmen at the gatherings of their brethren, their spokesmen, and they who take the initiative in united effort. But they are of no higher order than the youngest member of the episcopate, who is as much a bishop as the Bishop of Rome or the Archbishop of Canterbury.¹

What the Diocesan Council is to the diocese, that the National Council² is to the Church at large. This body consists of two Houses: The Upper, or House of Bishops, in which all Diocesan, Missionary, and Coadjutor Bishops have seats; and the House of Deputies, made up of

¹ "Wherever there is a Bishop, whether it be at Rome, or at Eugubium, whether it be at Constantinople or at Rhegium, whether it be at Alexandria or at Zoan, his dignity is one, and his priesthood is one. . . . All alike are successors of the Apostles." S. Jerome, A.D. 393.

² Or General Convention.

elected Deputies, four clerical and four lay from every diocese, and one delegate of each order from every missionary jurisdiction. Its powers are very extensive. It represents the National Church in session assembled, and its judgment is final in all matters affecting that Church. Its two Houses meet separately, and no act is valid without the concurrence of both. Such matters as the alteration of the Prayer-Book, the setting forth of new services, the selection of hymns to be sung, the founding of new dioceses, the alteration of the bounds of old ones, are all the work of the National Council ; which for unique interest takes its place among the greatest legislative bodies of the world. Indeed, membership in this august body is, rightly considered, one of the highest honors that the American Church can confer on her laity or clergy. In fine, the work of this Council is the same as that in which the Apostles of the Lord themselves engaged when they met in the first Council ever held.

But the American Church is infinitely larger than the Church of Apostles which met at Jerusalem. One realizes this on seeing the delegates come up from the ends of this vast Continent. Their assembling together is an imposing sight.

Yet, as now constituted, the National Council must go. Its day is past; its place will probably be taken by a body meeting not oftener than once in ten years, as the Pan-Anglican Conference meets now, and composed of only the Primates of Provinces, with certain elected Bishops, or it may be, of all the Bishops of the American Church, with or without, as the wisdom of the Church shall decide, a small body of chosen clerical and lay delegates as a second House.

Oh, may this great Church, a true National Church, whose Constitution is in striking harmony with that of the land in which she dwells "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners!"¹ May every blessing spoken to the seven Churches of Asia be hers, and may she need none of the warnings. May it be said of her, "The Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved."² She is not unworthy of the honor, she is no fragment, but the Church of and for the American people.

For this, whenever she is in session assembled,

¹ Song of Solomon vi. 10.

² Acts ii. 47.

and at other times as God gives us power and grace, well may we pray in the words of our Prayer-Book :

“ Almighty and everlasting God, who by thy Holy Spirit didst preside in the Council of the blessed Apostles, and hast promised, through thy Son Jesus Christ, to be with thy Church to the end of the world ; We beseech thee to be with the Council of thy Church assembled in thy Name and Presence. Save them from all error, ignorance, pride, and prejudice ; and of thy great mercy vouchsafe, we beseech thee, so to direct, sanctify, and govern them in their work, by the mighty power of the Holy Ghost, that the comfortable Gospel of Christ may be truly preached, truly received, and truly followed, in all places, to the breaking down the kingdom of sin, Satan, and death ; till at length the whole of thy dispersed sheep, being gathered into one fold, shall become partakers of everlasting life ; through the merits and death of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

IX.

CAUSES OF THE GREAT PROGRESS OF
THE CHURCH

IX.

CAUSES OF THE GREAT PROGRESS OF THE CHURCH

“The force of his own merit makes his way.”

—HENRY VIII., Act I., Sc. I.

OUR Church in America is growing more rapidly than any other member of the Catholic Family. She stands *facile princeps*, easily first. Her growth has been so remarkable that there is probably not another religious body which has within the past half century gone forward as she has. Indeed, her advance has been phenomenal. It has been at once the wonder of the indifferent, the envy of the unfriendly,¹ and the joy of her faithful children.

¹ “And what is still more remarkable is that the movement has been stronger than the rankest Protestantism, stronger than the Bishops, stronger than the lawyers and the Legislature. A spasmodic protest, a useless prosecution, a Delphic judgment, and the movement continues and spreads, lodging itself in Anglican homes and convents, in schools, Churches, and even Cathedrals, until it is rapidly covering the country. Has there ever been a more marvellous change, and this within half a century!”—Vide Address by Cardinal Vaughan to the Catholic Truth Society Conference, at Preston, England, September 10, 1894.

Her extraordinary growth suggests and even necessitates the inquiry as to what is its cause. The primary cause is simply that she is the Church of Christ. So long as the Church is true to Christ and relies on him, she must grow and prosper.

Students of Gibbon's "Decline and Fall" will remember the five famous secondary reasons which he assigns for the spread of Christianity. Have we anything in a similar way to assign as the cause of the rapid progress of our dear Church?

This is our present inquiry. To what is her onward advance due? In truth, there is no one cause, there are many causes, like the links of a mighty chain.

(1) We name first the clearing away of misunderstandings, by which she has become better known, more appreciated, and, if not revered and loved, at least esteemed and respected.

She was long thought of as merely a foreign Church. She is now acknowledged to be foreign only in the sense in which outside of the Holy Land all Christian Churches are foreign: for Jerusalem is the Mother of us all.

Of course there is a sense in which we can

rightly speak of a Church as "foreign." There is, *e.g.*, in our midst a Church organization to which no other name can properly be given. That particular organization is, in fact, nothing but a fragment of the national Church of Italy, whose alien character is suitably represented by an Italian Bishop, who came here unable to speak the English language.¹

But it is not so with us. Men no longer doubt that our Church is in perfect sympathy with American institutions and with American ideals. That was a striking scene when in Baltimore, in 1892, by the voice of her Supreme Legislative Council, she voluntarily relinquished some \$25,000 per annum and all claims on Government aid for

¹ Touching this Italian Bishop, the *Living Church* of January 26, 1895, gives us the following choice description: "Mgr. Satolli, on a visit to New York, took occasion, at a reception given in his honor at the La Salle Institute, to define the attitude of the Roman Church to the public schools of the country. The speech was, as a matter of fact, read by the Rev. Dr. Rooker, while Mgr. Satolli supplied the fitting gestures! They are described as 'appropriate and often forceful.' The only parallel instance we ever heard of was the case of a man who suddenly became crazed during a sermon, and, advancing to the front of the church, stationed himself just below the pulpit, and endeavored by his gesticulations to supply what he considered to be lacking in the preacher's style of delivery. The Italians are said to be masters of the art of gesture. Instances have been described where an entire speech was made perfectly intelligible in this way to those who did not understand a word of the language. The Roman delegate might very well have dispensed with the services of the reader altogether."

her Indian school work. It was not that she did not need the money. But she had come to look upon the receiving of money from the Public Funds as contrary to the letter and spirit of the American Constitution, and her duty was plain. She withdrew from the ranks of the beneficiaries, leaving it to other Christian bodies less in harmony with American ideals than herself, to scramble for the spoils and to eat of the Government bread!¹ Ever mindful of the duty to pray for rulers, this is her method by which she upholds them and points them to their own standard, and so furthers the fulfilment of her own prayers.

Nor has this been any late burst of loyalty out of harmony with her past. We indeed marvel greatly that she has ever been regarded as foreign; for from the days of Washington to this day her sons have been the famous statesmen and leaders of the American people. Of the fifty-five signers of the Declaration of Independence, over thirty-four were Churchmen, one only we believe a Roman Catholic.²

¹ The Roman Catholic Church takes nearly one-half million dollars out of the treasury. *Quarterly Message*, vol. ii., No. 4, p. 32.

² "Of the fifty-five actual signers of the Declaration of Independence, thirty-four were Churchmen; while at least seven other Churchmen, eli-

(2) HER REVERENT, DIGNIFIED, and SENSIBLE SERVICES.—Often do we hear something like the following: “I don’t like your doctrine of Apostolic Succession, nor your views on Baptism, nor your exclusiveness, but I do like your Services. They are so helpful and inspiring, so congregational, and so sweetly reasonable.” This admits not of question or dispute. The denominations are beginning to pay us the highest compliment in their power, by copying our Services. They already have antiphonal singing, say our Creed, sing our Glorias, and have processional. What they will do next, who dare say? We are not sure that this is the best thing for them. Lately there was a sort of funeral dirge over Methodism in London by one who claimed to have thirty years experience in that city. “I affirm,” said he, “that the leakage is a serious one. Metropolitan Methodism is losing its young men and young women. Where are they going, and why? They are going to the Church. Our liturgical services, with their choir-sung chants and their intoned

gible as signers by their votes in July, or by their membership of the Congress in August, were providentially hindered from giving their signatures, as they had recorded their votes, for the Declaration. Twelve of the signers were Congregationalists; four were Presbyterians; three were Quakers; one was a Baptist, and one was a Roman Catholic.”—BISHOP PERRY, in Iowa Churchman, May, 1893.

amens are training our sons and daughters to chafe at the simpler forms of worship, and sending them where this kind of thing is better done.”¹ Only the other day, in the North of England, “the grandest Non-conformist church in Europe, and one of the finest and most completely ecclesiastical buildings reared in our time,” was opened. Admiring descriptions were given of “the chancel, with its marble pulpit and baptistery, carved oak choir-stall, grand organ, elaborately carved panels of alabaster, and three beautiful lancet windows.” A great change this from the days of Puritan simplicity, when the presence of such things in the Church of England was one of the principal counts in the indictment against her—the days when the founders of Non-conformity set out to break up organs and smash beautiful windows, “to break down all the carved work thereof with axes and hammers,” and to convert baptismal fonts into garden-vases and horse-troughs! Plainly even Puritanism no longer puts its ban upon the beautiful in public worship, having learned that it might as well try “to keep down the rising tide of the Atlantic Ocean with a broom, as try to stop the movement for in-

¹ Church Bells, p. 996, November 16, 1894.

creasing the glory and beauty of public worship."

But it is not only brighter and more devoted Services which is the object of their search who come from them to us. They are craving union with that grand old historic Church which existed ages before their own began to be. Yet undoubtedly the statement is true in part. Our nature craves something more than there is in a bald and frigid service, and they are unable to read the signs of the times who fail to appreciate this. It was indeed one of themselves, a prophet of their own, who said, "It is not always social fashion, love of music, or a languid admiration of ecclesiastical performances that takes some of our best young people to the Episcopal Communion, but the need of more helpful and satisfying worship than can be found in most non-Episcopal Churches."¹ Nowhere is this seen to such an extent as in the "Auld Kirk" of Scotland, where we find not only the organs, the stained-glass windows, the elaborate music, and the Gothic architecture, where they were formerly frowned upon; but in many quarters, a decided advance in the direction of the observance of the Church's Year

¹ Church Bells, April 6, 1894.

as well as of a more or less liturgical service. In one of the largest of the Established churches in the city of Aberdeen, there is daily service; our Church's Litany is used on Fridays, and the Apostles' Creed and collect for the day are repeated at every service. Again, in the oldest and most important of the Edinburgh churches, S. Giles's (commonly though erroneously called S. Giles's Cathedral), the Lord's Prayer is repeated by the congregation, while amens and hymns are sung, and the service as a whole is such as, a few years ago, no one would have dreamed of seeing in a Presbyterian kirk. Moreover, for many years a society known as the Church Service Society has been in existence, whose object is the raising of the character of the public worship, and a Prayer-Book issued by this society is now used in several Scottish churches.

Thus by the confession and the practice of those who differ from us, our Services, free from the barrenness on the one hand of Puritanism, and from the excesses and childish performances that so quickly turn the sublime into the ridiculous on the other, are a stronghold of our Zion, and a mighty sword in our hands.

(3) THE POSSESSION OF A PRAYER-BOOK.—*Now*

you will find our Prayer-Book where a few years ago its presence would have been as distasteful as a scarlet acolyte in a Presbyterian kirk, and where it would have caused a similar sensation. True, it is not always as ours. But the old Church recognizes her daughter even when clad in another garb, and called by another name. Honor to whom honor is due. Let it ring out that this book is the Church's child and not another's. A year or two ago, in a Detroit bookstore, a copy of the Prayer-Book lay on the counter. Taking it into his hands, a young minister turned to an elder companion, and said, "Look, Dr. so and so, what these Episcopalians have done. They have actually stolen our Baptismal Service and put it into their Book." "Hush," said the elder, "that was in their Book two hundred years before we were heard of!" A former generation knew its indebtedness: the present knows it not.

Now, observe what this old Book is doing. There are whole families coming into our Church to-day simply through its silent agency. A copy of it fallen into their hands, has been like leaven. Before its quiet teaching prejudices have disappeared, errors have been corrected, and untaught

by priest or deacon, or even by lay-evangelist, many have come to seek baptism and rest for their souls in the old Church of Christ. It is indeed one of the great unifying elements of our world-scattered race. In the midst of lives sordid with constant care and dark with the impending shadow of want and the darker gloom of death, its services, attuned to the note of 'Our Father,' make for one brief hour music and melody, with gladness and joy, in the hearts of miserable men. It is the constant renewed affirmation of 'God's English-speaking men' of their faith in their father's God. For hundreds of years its solemn words have embodied all the highest and best thought of the greatest and noblest, and doubtless for many hundred years to come the English-speaking race will find the expression of their hopes and their aspirations in the simple but stately words of the Book of Common Prayer.

(4) THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.—Again, of a like influence has been the Christian Year. Order is Heaven's first law. It was well for the Church Militant on earth to take note of this. She has not put the responsibility of teaching the due proportion of truth upon her ministers alone. She has assumed that responsibility herself, by

formulating what is called "the Christian Year." Churchmen are so accustomed to this cycle of Christian truth that they do not always know how great a blessing it really is. They use it, they love it, and even value it; but they do not always comprehend how absolutely necessary it is for their souls' progress.

Perhaps, as they see the denominational bodies generally adopting first one part of it, then another, its great value may become more apparent to them. Nowadays there is hardly a religious body which does not keep Easter; and soon Lent will be as universally kept. Yet officially of Lent or Easter the dissenting protestant bodies know absolutely nothing. All their information is derived second-hand from the Church.

Well, what is the probable end of any Christian body that first borrows its style of Services from the Church, next appropriates her Prayer-Book, then peers into her calendars to see when her Holy Days and Festivals fall, that she may observe them too? For these, at all events, our Church is as the Hill of Zion, from whence goes "forth the law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

(5) HER HOLD ON THE CULTIVATED CLASSES.
—In this respect our Church is the exact op-

posite of the Roman Catholic. The members of that Church are drawn largely from the illiterate and even the dangerous element. We say this not unkindly. Indeed there is no room for unkindness. Of the early Christians it was said that among them there were not many mighty and not many noble. But in this nineteenth century, it is doubtless a serious indictment of any Church that she has in comparison of her numbers few intellectual men in her ranks. Among the intellectual our Church is confessedly strong. Her members furnish no inconsiderable share of the refinement, intelligence, education, wealth, and religious zeal of the country, so that she has even been called the Church of the classes. Curiously enough, this fact has sometimes been made a ground of argument against her. It was lately said,¹ "Very many of the fashionable churches are closing for the heated term. The reverend ministers are going away to the seashore and the mountains to recuperate. In the meanwhile all the Catholic Churches will remain open, every day in the year, as well as Sundays." Precisely. There is a fitness in things; where else would they have the Clergy than with their

¹ "Pittsburg Catholic."

congregations? Our critic is curiously short-sighted. He reminds us of a story told by one¹ of our bishops: A member of the Roman Catholic Church was comparing unfavorably our Clergy with the Roman, saying that they were not as zealous in the performance of their pastoral duties. "How so?" said the bishop; "I must say that I had never observed that fact." "Why, right here in this paper is a proof of it," said the Roman; "there is the account of a priest attending a man on the scaffold who was about to die. I never heard of any of your Episcopal Clergy in such a place." "No," replied the bishop, "and I hope you never will. They don't lose any members in such an unhappy way. But if they were so unfortunate, you can depend upon it they would be there to do their duty."

(6) HER EFFORT TOWARD CHURCH UNITY.—Whatever that effort may result in, the fact that she has made it will redound to her honor. Glorious things are already spoken of her. She who for years past had been praying that God would take away "our unhappy divisions," arose, with all the strength she had, to fight with the giant which has so long defied the armies of Israel.

¹ Bishop Wilmer's "Recent Past."

While others were sighing for a deliverer, she went into the valley to fight with the Philistine. For this men are now honoring her. They have taken note that it is not her wish to remain separate. The simple faith to realize under God's blessing her own prayers has made her a power in the land. Her ideal may be visionary, but it is noble. Yet with a mighty faith she is working for its accomplishment. "For my brethren and companions' sakes: I will wish thee prosperity. Yea, because of the house of the Lord our God: I will seek to do thee good."¹ Meanwhile we are thankful that we are members of a Church which has been the first in all Christendom to hold out the olive branch and make a definite proposal for peace and union.

(7) THE FAITHFUL ASSERTION OF HER RIGHTFUL POSITION HAS BEEN OF INESTIMABLE VALUE TO HER.—Some time ago a prominent minister of the Baptist denomination, finding that the Baptists had increased only 36 per cent. since 1870, while the Episcopalians had increased 141 per cent. in the State of New York, and recognizing that the growth was not local, but was in every part of the United States, cast about for an

¹ Ps. cxxii., 8, 9.

explanation. His words are worthy of careful attention. He "was convinced that the true explanation of this growth is to be found in the confidence, assurance, and courage of the Episcopalian leaders. They believe that theirs is 'the Church,' and are not slow to assert their belief. That very assurance and the exclusiveness which comes from it, is the tower of their strength. They are not ashamed of their belief; they have the courage of their convictions, and a large part of the world takes them at their own estimate. Here is the secret of their power." This is a clear and, we believe, a true judgment. It is indeed striking testimony, as coming from an outsider, that not those who are minimizing her claims, and making light of her Catholic heritage, breaking down the middle wall of partition and condemning her as exclusive, are her best friends; but those who are consistently maintaining at all costs her inherent rights and fundamental principles are the true builders of our Zion.

(8) SHE HAS GROWN THROUGH HER TRIALS. —She has come out of the furnace of affliction to grow all the stronger in consequence of her fiery ordeals. "Sub pondere cresce" (Grow under your load) was the motto of John Spruell, of

Glasgow, imprisoned on the Bass Rock in the Firth of Forth. This is a law of nature, which also has governed the Church, and she is strong to-day because she has borne and suffered.

(9) THE BROAD AND LIBERAL SPIRIT which characterizes the Church: the generous way in which she deals with her children.—She takes the Bible and, putting it into the hands of all, says “Search the Scriptures,” imposing no rules with respect to their reading. She has no Index Expurgatorius, no lists of forbidden books, nor does she put a ban upon innocent pleasures and amusements. Her motto is: Let everyone be fully persuaded in his own mind. She is trustful to a fault, and already she is reaping her reward. “Trust the people” is an old political motto. It has been tried by our Church and has not been falsified. If the time ever should come again when men shall cry, “Down with her! down with her, even to the ground!” while wild anarchy sweeps through the land and foundations are thrown down, then her children, rising up in their thousands will cry, “Hold!”

“Woodman, spare that tree,
Touch not a single bough;
In youth it sheltered me,
And I’ll protect it now!”

It is due in part to this spirit of trustfulness that distinguishes her, that she gives her laymen so considerable a share in all government of the Church. In the selection of pastors, even in the choice of bishops, in local Church affairs and in the Supreme Councils of the National Church, the layman's voice and the layman's vote are never absent. There are, indeed, those who deprecate the large power which has thus been entrusted to the laity; we are not of such. On the contrary, we rejoice at it, believing that the custom is not merely primitive and Apostolic, Catholic in the best and widest sense, but that it is also for the truest welfare of the Church herself.

(10) LAST BUT NOT LEAST; SHE HAS NO POLITICS.—President Lincoln is credited with saying (to Mr. Seward, who was a churchman), "When I join a Church it will be the Episcopal, because it has neither politics nor religion."

The terse wisdom of the late President's epigrams is well known; we may be pardoned if we somewhat agree with him in this.

The Episcopal Church has no politics. Whilst our Civil War was raging, like every other religious body in our land, she felt the strain. Brethren were parted from brethren. But there

was no schism in the fold. Unity of faith kept them together. They were Churchmen first, politicians afterward. There were, of course, ardent spirits on both sides, who flung themselves into the fight. A bishop even left his diocese and fell as a soldier at the head of his troops. But as soon as the war was over all churchmen came together again. When the General Convention met in October, 1865, at Philadelphia, Bishop Lay, of Arkansas, and Bishop Atkinson, of North Carolina, were present at the opening session—though from the South, they were still bishops of the Church. It was a great proof of the power of the Church and a happy omen for the future. In the pages of the Church history of that day, the only permanent record of the strife which can be found is the canon which, without any direct allusion to the dead Bishop Polk, declares: "It is the sense of this house that the Clergy shall not bear arms."

But what sort of a thing is a Church without religion? We confess the words give us at first a shock. Such a Church would seem to us to be as a cloud without water, or salt without its savor. But a moment's consideration shows us that we have here one of those pithy sayings

which made Lincoln famous the world over. For he was not speaking of "religion," as S. James defines it, but as he had met with it among the sectarians, where men and women "get religion" as one gets a fever or a cold. The phrase is its own condemnation. Religion is not something which comes from without, but is that which is built up from within. First the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear, is its true course.

This is the sort of religion the Church honors, but, alas, the other sort consisted mainly in loud professions of pharisaic superiority. With the Church, "the trivial round, the common task" is the ordinary course and channel of holy living and of holy dying. Religion is duty—religion is life, and Christians remembering this are to be as the salt in the mighty ocean, everywhere an unseen, silent, and all-powerful agency for final good. Perhaps most of all, the Church of Christ is growing amongst us because she stands for this *substantial* thing.

X.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE
CHURCH

X.

POPULAR OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE CHURCH

“ Whoever thinks a faultless piece to see,
Thinks what ne’er was, nor is, nor e’er shall be.”
—POPE : “ Essay on Criticism.”

WE have now to deal with some popular objections against the Church. Time has been when our Church was regarded as the setter-forth of a religion so easy, that it was naïvely asserted there were but two ways of leaving her—one by dying, the other by being converted! Those were days when the Church was commonly thought of as an ecclesiastical Agag, loving to walk delicately, and in whose sight the soul of an aristocrat was infinitely more precious than that of a collier or street organ-grinder. Who could wonder at this, if she only lived, as was said, on the dry husks of formalism? Happily charges such as these need no refutation now. Yet there are four charges

still made which demand our attention, inasmuch as they are widely accepted as substantially true. These are :

1. That she is copying the usages of the Roman Church and doing *her* work.

2. That she has not the Apostolic Succession she claims.

3. That she is narrow, and even bigoted.

4. That there is no uniformity, either of doctrine or ritual, in her teaching and services.

The onward march of our Church has naturally developed a critical spirit against her ; a spirit extreme to mark what is done amiss. She is as a city set on a hill. Envy commonly dogs the footsteps of success. To stand well with the multitude is to stand ill with the Iagos who are in jealous minority. Aristides had done the man who voted for his banishment no injury, as he himself confessed ; but it was gall and wormwood to him to hear Aristides continually called "The Just."

And were the Church as free from evil as she will be when there shall nothing enter into her that "defileth or worketh abomination, or maketh a lie," she shall not escape calumny. The world is "nothing, if not critical ;" therefore we must

look the more narrowly at all accusations brought against her.

The first objection we deal with is :

1. That she is copying the usages of the Roman Church, and doing her work. We are told that she is undoing the glorious Reformation, and so forth—ad nauseam. This is no new charge. The Puritans, over three hundred years ago, brought it against her ; and since then, from time to time, it has been advanced with remarkable persistence. Whenever, indeed, she has attempted to be more obedient to her own standards of faith and worship, and thereby better serve her Master, it has been the established usage to shout “ No Popery ” at her, until the cry has become perennial—a sort of stock objection—an item held over for the “ silly season.”

Now, here we pause a moment to utter a protest. Romanism is not the summum malum of the universe. There are worse things, and enshrined in this very accusation there is a worse thought. Rather any day would we be of Rome's most thorough-going disciples, a full-fledged Ultramontane—a typical Torquemada, Grand Inquisitor-General—than be one who, owing allegiance to another Church, is but a sorry imitator

of a Church which his own declares has erred, not only in matters of ceremony, but also in matters of faith. A consistent papist we might honor; a mere apist we can never honor. The position of the one is compatible with uprightness of heart and integrity of life; that of the other is incompatible from every aspect. The one is, after all, a man; the other merely a parasite. Yet mark this, it is of apism we are accused. We are charged to be, forsooth, as the daw in borrowed plumes, and as an ass in the lion's skin!

Men may, if they will, ridicule our doctrines and practices, call them absurd, childish, superstitious, mediæval, and the like, and we shall feel ourselves under no obligation to reply nor shall our feelings thereby be hurt. Such accusations are not, it may be, quite complimentary to our intellectual faculties, but they do not attack our moral character. When, however, we are accused of being parasites and plagiarists, of wearing stolen plumes, of being traitors in the camp, then justly is the fire kindled, and at the last we speak with our tongue!

And we protest the more because this charge has worked very much evil. Believing it, in the past a few of our weak-kneed brethren have left

us : some to find a refuge in the arms of Puritanism ; some to end all doubt and stifle all further inquiry, among the very enemy they both dreaded and yet sought, fascinated by the cry, "Come over to us ; ours is the only Church ; we navigate the only lifeboat

' O'er life's wild, restless sea.' "

Now, when general charges are made, to ask for an instance has sometimes a very sobering effect. A man may have worked himself up into a perfect white heat of excitement, but say "an illustration, please"—and there is peace. Popery has been a name to conjure with. It has been the red flag to the enraged bull of ultra-Protestantism ; the summons to war which no true Protestant could possibly neglect ; the signal for a grand and united effort to free the Father's house from thieves masquerading in stolen vestments ! But this charge is, after all, but merely general, and we justly ask for a special case ; and this the more as the ground of objection is so constantly being changed, and we are therefore somewhat in danger of beating the air !—Because the ring in marriage, kneeling at prayer, the surplice in the pulpit, the keeping of Christmas, even the episco-

pate and the use of the prayer-book, have all been often objected to as popish. Nor are such ridiculous and unchristian objections entirely unheard of now. Even at this present day, the altar cross, prized here as a symbol of our faith, is actually forbidden in the Church of Ireland! O suicidal blindness! Is then the Cross of Christ the abomination of desolation, standing in the Holy Place where it ought not? "Tell it not in Gath; publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph." ¹ Lest even Hindus and Mohammedans hail such tidings with delight! But "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." ²

Ever since the crucifixion of our Lord that cross has been the emblem of man's salvation, and well therefore may every Christian sing:

"In the Cross of Christ I glory
Towering o'er the wrecks of time;
All the light of sacred story,
Gathers round its head sublime."

As we ask our question, we shall probably receive the answer that the "six points of ritual" in use

¹ 2 Sam. i. 20.

² Gal. vi. 14.

in the "extreme churches"—Lights, wafer bread, vestments, the eastward position, the mixed chalice, incense, are all of Rome. Such is the charge. Ere we proceed to examine it, let us ask first, what is "Roman?" And we answer at once, that is properly called Roman, and only that, which is a practice, ceremony, or doctrine originating in or peculiar to Rome. Now, tried by this test, those "points" are no more Roman than are hands or feet, hats or shoes. If they belong exclusively to any Church, they belong to the Jewish; for what are altar lights but the survival of the Temple lights to which Christ pointed on the Feast of Tabernacles, saying "I am the light of the world;"¹ and which our own Cranmer said should remain for that very signification? And what is wafer bread but the unleavened bread of the Jewish Passover Service? What are eucharistic vestments but the ordinary clothes of Jewish citizens in Christ's day? What is the eastward position but a survival of such practices as that of Daniel, who in Babylon looked toward Jerusalem, as he knelt upon his knees three times a day? What is the mixed chalice but the third cup of wine which Jewish practice had

¹ John viii. 12.

long before added to the ritual of the Passover? What, after all, the use of incense but the fulfilment of Malachi's prophecy, that in the new Church, as in the old Church, "Incense should be offered everywhere and a pure offering."¹ Call these things whatever else you will, but if you speak of them as "Roman," the ninety millions of Greek Christians will cry "Hold! We used these things even before we gave Rome her Christianity, and we still use them. They have been and are still of the Catholic Church as a whole, and not of any one part, however large or however venerable."

Please do not misunderstand us here. We are not concerned with the question whether such points of ritual are now desirable. With that question we have nothing to do. S. Paul's rule, indeed, is clear and may well be our guide: "All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawful for me, but all things edify not."² We need not be wiser than the great Apostle, who to the Jews was a Jew, and to the Greeks a Greek. The point at issue is this, and only this: Are these forms in any sense borrowed from Rome? And the answer, the emphatic answer, is, of necessity, No!

¹ Malachi i. 11.

² 1 Cor. x. 23.

Undoubtedly there are things which are Rome's own peculiar invention. The saying of prayers in a tongue not understood of the people is Roman; so is the mutilation of the Sacrament of Holy Communion; so is the elevation of the Blessed Virgin Mary to a throne almost above her Son; so is Rome's doctrine of Purgatory and her doctrine of Indulgences; so is her forbidding to marry, at least since the days of the heretics condemned by the Apostle S. Jude; so are the Papal claims, for Rome is the only Church possessing a Supreme Head upon Earth, who would rule in the Kingdom of God and give it to whomsoever he will; so is the Papal Infallibility. But of these doctrines and practices, and others as uncatholic, there is not a trace in our Prayer-Book, nor in our Creeds or standards.

That there are those who give occasion to the enemy to find fault, we cannot deny. All are not Israel who are of Israel. But the *Church* is sound. The eccentricities of misguided individuals, which she gently bears with on the one side or the other, are indeed a hindrance, but yet not her fault. That she does not cast them out is due to that charity which suffereth long and is kind.

But after all, what are they in comparison of the vast number of her loyal sons who

Beyond their highest joy
Do prize her heavenly ways ;
Her sweet communion, solemn vows,
Her hymns of love and praise.

There is such a sin as that of bearing false witness. Let those who would fling the charge that our Church is copying Roman ritual and teaching Roman doctrine remember this. The one Church which Rome fears, the one Church whose grand work, rapid progress, and influential standing she envies, the one Church of all Churches farthest from her model and nearest to the Apostolic—is she a mere parasite and a plagiarist? Away with such a thought, away with it! Even Rome is under no such delusion! She does not claim that this Church is doing *her* work. “The Anglican Church,”¹ says the *Civitta Catolica* (a Jesuit paper published in Rome), “seems to stand in the way of the hopes of the Jesuits, and to be the obstacle to the final victory of Rome over England.”

2. IT IS SAID THAT OUR CHURCH HAS NOT THE APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION, WHICH SHE CLAIMS.—We do not propose to enter on this question now.

¹ Living Church, July 15, 1893.

It is like those other objections—a stock argument, somewhat threadbare from use, and dependent for its propagation upon stout assertion rather than upon sober statement and proof. We are not greatly concerned as to what people generally think of our Orders. For us, Anglican Orders are above suspicion. If the clergy of the American Church are not as much priests as any others can ever be, they would never dare to ascend the altar steps to mete out the Bread of Life. We may hope that our Roman brethren will soon on this point be better informed than they now appear to be. The Bishop of Rome himself seems to be sharing this hope, for he has lately appointed a commission to inquire into the question of their validity. Such kindly interest should meet with reciprocity. The American Church might also appoint a similar commission to satisfy some of us that Roman Orders are equally valid. But whatever the report of the Roman commission may be, Anglican Orders are good enough for Anglicans; if anyone thinks otherwise we are sorry for him. “A threefold cord is not quickly broken.”¹ Our Orders are bound by such a cord. If they fail, all others must fail with them. “If the righteous scarcely be

¹ Eccl. iv. 12.

saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"¹

3. OUR CHURCH IS SAID TO BE NARROW AND EXCLUSIVE.—Far from being at all narrow, she is singularly liberal. She, *e.g.*, grants all that other Christian bodies claim for their ministers, which is more than they commonly will do for ours. We are willing, writes one of our bishops, to allow their ministers to be what their convictions and their seals of God's approval testify them to be, viz., evangelists, teachers, preachers of the Word. But realizing as we do the greater illuminations and resources and potentialities of grace given under the fuller administrations of the priesthood of Christ's body, which we by God's mercy possess, we desire them, so much more worthy as many of them are than ourselves, to be partakers of these spiritual gifts.²

Thirty years ago a bishop and a priest were crossing the Coast Range of California, from Santa Cruz on the Bay of Monterey to the Santa Clara Valley. "We two," writes the priest, "were the only passengers, and the day was full of interest, made especially so by the bishop's account of his many

¹ 1 Peter iv. 18.

² Bishop Grafton quoted in *Public Opinion*, May 3, 1894.

and strange adventures as missionary in the then new and remote Northwest.

“Among other things, I asked him how he managed to get along with the many ‘ministers of the denominations’ whom he must constantly meet. ‘Oh,’ said he, ‘I generally get on with them famously, if only they will let me;’ and I could well imagine, from his genial and kindly manner, that he would do so. ‘But how do you manage it?’ ‘Well,’ said he, ‘I accept them on their own terms. I account them to be just what they claim to be—Methodist ministers, Baptist ministers, and what not. We have no quarrel about that. Of course they are a little nervous and fidgety, and sometimes complain that we “Episcopals do not recognize” them, and all that, and call us “bigoted” and “intolerant,” and other pleasant and familiar names; but I assure them they are entirely mistaken, we do recognize them fully. They, of course, express surprise at this; they had never so understood it, and then go on and complain that it could not be so, because they are not admitted to our pulpits, and that we do not admit them to be “the same as ourselves.” ‘Let us talk about that,’ say I. ‘Now, you are a minister, say, a minister of the

Baptist Church, or of the Methodist; I don't question that at all, I fully recognize the fact; I recognize you fully in that capacity; we can have no quarrel about it.' 'But— but—' says the man, 'that is all so; still, you do not recognize us as the same as yourselves, as holding office equal to yours.' 'Let us see about that,' I answer. 'Now, I claim to be a Bishop of the Holy Catholic Church, established by the Lord Jesus Christ Himself and His Apostles—a successor of those apostles in their apostleship, I trace my official ancestry back to the Lord Himself, who said: "Go, teach all nations." Now, do you claim to be that?' Of course the man answers, No! and then sometimes—usually—he breaks out in denunciation of all such "absurd and arrogant nonsense;" says there is no such thing as an apostolic ministry; the Apostles are all dead long ago, and have no "successors;" it is all a "figment," an "imposition"; "there is no priesthood," and all that. I hear him patiently, and reply: "Now, my friend, don't let us quarrel, and call hard names. It is not right; it is uncharitable. I admit *you* to be all you claim. I don't abuse you; I don't question your position; can't you do the same? Won't you do the same as you

are done by? You call us "uncharitable" because we do not reckon you to be what you do not reckon yourselves. Think it over, friend, and tell me where the intolerance and want of charity come in.' So I manage them, and generally they have no more to say."

Narrow ! Exclusive ! We are of an exactly contrary opinion. Surely scales must be on the eyes of those who make this charge. There is in reality no Church so broad. Seeking, it may be, baptism or confirmation from her, you apply to a bishop or priest of the Church to know what is required of you, and from each one you hear but this: Belief in the Apostles' Creed. This was all the Church required from the Ethiopian eunuch ; this is all she asks of *you*.

But you say : Am I not required to believe in the apostolic succession ? In baptismal regeneration, and other like teachings ? Not unless your conscience tells you to. Some, even of her clergy, do not so believe. We wish they did ; for we are convinced, not merely of the truth of the doctrines, but of the great helpfulness which a firm conviction of their truth brings. Yet the Church willingly receives them as if they did. She in fact rejects none who hold the great verities of

the Christian Faith, as contained in the Apostles' Creed.

But once more you ask: Is there not a rule that none can be admitted to Holy Communion unless he be confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed? To be sure she has such a rule, and to us it seems sweet reasonableness and simplicity itself. Under it, even a Presbyterian or Methodist can be admitted to confirmation without necessarily becoming an Episcopalian. The Church will confirm anyone reverently seeking the gift, as she confirmed the famous Methodist minister, Dr. Adam Clark. She does so, moreover, without asking what your views are about Church government or non-liturgical services. Again, still unmindful of those questions, when once confirmed, she says, lovingly: "Ye who do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins, and are in love and charity with your neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways, draw near with faith, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort." All that she asks is that you hold the essentials of the Catholic faith, that faith once delivered to the saints, and be desirous of leading a holy life.

Satisfied on this point, she insists upon no further tests, and forthwith looks upon you as her own child. She henceforth treats you neither better nor worse than those who are in full sympathy with all her teachings and practices. Is there another communion in all Christendom that will do the same? Our Church has one simple rule, open to all to keep; pledging them to no more than a living faith in the Son of God. But she does ask this without respect of persons. Yet whatever your answer be, she never meets you at the fords of Jordan, and slays you without mercy if you cannot say her Shibboleth!

4. WE DIFFER FAR TOO WIDELY IN THE CHARACTER OF OUR SERVICES.—We must be pardoned if we call attention to the contradictory character of these objections. Still, not to be over-critical, we admit we do differ widely. There is in very truth a wonderful diversity of ritual in our services, and up to a certain point, even in matters of faith. Here are two churches, not far apart in distance, but far apart in all else. One is "Low," the other "High." In these two churches the very vestments of the clergy tell their own story. In the one we see a surplice of such flowing dimensions that it is in excellent

keeping with a black stole of like heroic proportions, which gives to its wearer a sad, funereal appearance. In the other we see what is called a "cotta," of dimensions so exceedingly slender that dire poverty seems to be its only justification or plea. These things are typical—typical of the men, of their teachings, of their churches, and of their services. A great distance parts them asunder. There is, however, between these two extremes, another brother who, being all things to all men, calls himself "Broad." You cannot classify him. You can never predict what he will do or say. He is one day attending the opening services of a new denominational church in his vicinity, and the next "assisting at High Mass." He is, the world says, a many-sided man; whole-souled; a veritable tower of strength to his Church. This may be so, but how can that Church which claims him as her minister be narrow?

Now, for this diversity we are thankful. To us it is no objection; on the contrary, it is a strong recommendation. It is an evidence of life, of vigorous life. Human nature is not to be bottled up and laid upon a shelf.

It was never intended to be so cribbed, cabined,

and confined. Look around. Is there anywhere this terrible uniformity for which some crave? Is the sky the same day after day? Is the weather the same? Are all the leaves of the trees cut after the same pattern, faultlessly alike in size and color, shape and appearance? Are men and women all alike in brains and strength and goodness? No such uniformity do we see. Dull monotony you cannot find. Diversity means life; uniformity, death. Everything that God has made is noted for its variety, and it would be a dull, heavy, and uninteresting world if it were not so. Variety is Nature's charm.

Variety's the very spice of life,
That gives it all its flavor.

Once in the long history of the Anglican Church this diversity was sought to be ended by the arm of strength. Odo, Bishop of Salisbury, attempted it and failed, and the Church suffered for years in consequence of the attempt.

And we are not in sympathy with any movement which would seek to end it now. The great beauty of the Episcopal Church is that it *is* wide, as human nature is wide. Do you love the beautiful in art? You will find it in the more ornate

services of the Church. In a day when the beautiful is being cultivated everywhere, she gives your soul full play. Are you puritanically inclined? Does an ornate ritual serve no good purpose for you, rather hindering than helping the devotional spirit? She is ready to give you a service that will help you, and make your heart leap with joy!

We do not seek cast-iron uniformity, since God did not make us uniform by nature. The Charity School where the inmates all dress alike in sober gray and wear garments all cut to one pattern and almost one size, is not our model.

Thus the objection is no objection at all but a gain, and one of our most prized possessions. As we value unity in essentials and charity in all things, so do we value perfect liberty in all those matters which touch not the essential and eternal verities of the Catholic faith. This is the heritage of the Saints, and in teaching us to prize it doth this Church rule us prudently with all her power.

XI.

THE BIBLE

XI.

THE BIBLE

“ Within this ample volume lies
The mystery of mysteries.
Happiest they of human race
To whom their God has given grace
To read, to fear, to hope, to pray,
To lift the latch, to force the way ;
And better had they ne’er been born
Who read to doubt, or read to scorn.”

—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

APART from its claim to be God’s Word to man, and from all that that claim involves, the Bible, simply on account of its venerable age, may well challenge the respectful attention of mankind. Some of its writings are the most ancient known. To trace them to their source involves a journey far back into antiquity—even as far back as some 1,500 years before Christ. On this account, then, do we value the Bible—that it tells us what no other book can. If by any chance it could be seen to be untrustworthy, history would then be

but as a book out of which the earlier chapters had been torn away !

It opens with the Pentateuch, or Five Books of Moses, recording the story of God's dealings with his people Israel. The succeeding books of Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles carry on that story until, under King Solomon, the tribes of Israel reach their golden age, and forthwith, alas ! enter upon that decline which paused not until the remnant of them were exiles in Babylon. In the books which follow—of Ezra and Nehemiah—we read of their home-coming and the rebuilding of their city and temple. Then one more book—that of Esther—tells us a tale of the captivity, and the story for a while ceases.

Parallel with these historical records there are five other books of a different character—books of sacred song and philosophical discussion, of sweet allegory and pithy proverb—all written in the measured flow of Hebrew poetry. One of these—the Book of Psalms—has brought consolation to generations ever since ; another—Ecclesiastes—was, according even to Renan, the only charming book ever written by a Jew.

Sixteen prophetical books follow next in order.

“The prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”¹ Isaiah, who lived some eight hundred years before Christ, was the first of these; and Malachi, who lived four centuries after him, was the last. Then for four centuries more there is an unbroken silence.

Next the four Gospels give to the world an all-too-short account of the earthly life of the Son of God. These are followed by the book of the Acts of the Apostles, wherein we are told of the rise and progress of the Church during its first thirty years; then follow twenty-one Epistles written by three or four of the chief Apostles; and last of all the book of The Revelation of S. John the Divine, which closes forever the sacred volume. This last book is as sweet music to the ear. Its writer, “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” reveals his mystic visions of the future of the Church and of the eternal purposes of God, as they are being unrolled in history, foreshadowing the final victory and the eternal crowning of the glorified Christ, King of Kings and Lord of Lords!

Sixty books are there in all—a library indeed—

¹ 2 Peter i. 21.

written by some forty different writers, among whom are fishermen and herdsmen, shepherds and physicians, lawgivers and lawyers, priests and kings. Begun, as we have said, 1,500 years B.C., this library was not completed until A.D. 96. But, though we group the books together, we are conscious that the silence between Malachi and the Gospels is as the ocean which parts the Old World from the New, and, as naturally and as rightly as we speak of an Old World and a New, so do we in like manner speak of the Old and the New Testaments.

And yet, as there is but the one world, so is there here in unity of thought and purpose but the one Book. When Mohammed was asked for a miracle, he offered the Koran. The Christian, thinking of its wondrous unity, might more reasonably offer the Bible. Throughout it there runs continuously but one and the same teaching. Never mind who the particular author may be, or what the outward form of his teaching, there is one thought only—one root-idea—running through it all. In the Old Testament that thought is "Messiah cometh." In the New, it is "Messiah hath come," and the old maxim stands approved: All roads in the Bible lead to Christ.

This unity is indeed more than marvellous; it is divine :

“ Whence, but from Heaven, could men unskilled in arts,
In several ages born, in several parts,
Weave such agreeing truths ? Or how, or why
Should they conspire to cheat us with a lie ? ”

Next, we are to speak of “ the difficulties in the Bible.”

The Bible does not come to us unencumbered with difficulty. What worth having does, except the great phenomena of Nature ? The beautiful rain and the warm sunshine come down for our welfare, be our negligence what it may. But it is not so in other matters. Gold is not showered down upon us. Pearls are not washed up at our feet. That which is better than either, a beautiful and lovely character, is not gained without an effort, not retained without a struggle. We may, therefore, expect to find difficulties in Scripture as we do in Nature, and the more, since Scripture itself recognizes their existence ; for one portion of it bears this witness to another portion : “ In which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction.” ¹

¹ 2 Pet. iii. 16.

What are these difficulties?

1. The Scriptures were written in strange languages--the Old Testament for the most part in Hebrew, and the New in Greek. Now, Hebrew as such is no longer a spoken language; in its ancient form it is, like the Latin, practically dead. The New Testament has come down to us in Greek, but yet not free from textual problems. Here, then, is our first difficulty. The story of God's dealing with His people is not revealed to us in the tongue in which we were born, nor yet even in languages any longer spoken in their purity.

2. There is also a wide difference in the age and style of the different writings. This is rather a complication of the first. Physicians tell us that complications always increase danger. Imagine a volume containing Anglo-Saxon chronicles and a part of the Domesday Book, some of Cædmon's poems and Bede's "Ecclesiastical History," with a treatise by Duns Scotus or Sir Thomas More, the Provisions of Oxford with the Declaration of Independence, some of Chaucer's tales and three or four of Carlyle's essays, a volume of Barrow's sermons with a report of the Lexow Committee, Longfellow's poems with a chapter or two

from Kidd's "Social Evolution," and then let these be all bound together in one book. After a thousand years have passed away, let a Japanese scholar translate this ancient volume into the language of his countrymen; and the Japanese of that day, if they wish to find fault with the book, will easily be able to do so—readily making that which should have been for their enlightenment an occasion of falling, even a subject of jest and gibe. But whether they would show their wisdom or unutterable folly by so doing is quite another matter.

3. There is another yet greater difficulty. We have not the original manuscripts, nor is there a single one of them left in existence. Although the first writings date back three thousand five hundred years, no known Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament is even one thousand years old. It is not much better with the New. Even of that we have nothing that S. John or S. Paul or S. Peter ever saw. The oldest copy we have was made at least four centuries after their death. It is true that we have a large number of early manuscript copies, yet, as they all differ somewhat from each other, although in the main agreeing, their very numbers add to our difficulties. If the

trumpet gives an uncertain sound, how can we know what is piped or harped? Who is to tell us, among thousands of different readings, which particular one is correct?

There are other so-called difficulties, which come through changes in the meaning of words in our own language. We are told that the Bible is inconsistent; that in one place God is said to have tempted Abraham, and in another that He tempts no man. But there is no substantial contradiction in that. The word "tempt" is often used in the sense of testing:

" Whom shall we find
Sufficient? Who shall *tempt* with wandering feet
The dark, unbottomed, infinite abyss?"

These are some of the difficulties. How do we meet them?

First, we would ask, What, in this connection, is meant by the word "difficulty?" To what has it reference, and what is its precise force? If it is meant that we shall find it difficult, in view of such facts as we have mentioned, to accept the Bible, just as we now have it printed, as in every particular the very Word of God, then we frankly admit that these *are* difficulties, and that they are insuperable; we can no more overcome them

than we can “bind the sweet influences of Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion.”¹ But we are not committed to any such hopeless enterprise. Our English Bible is but a translation—one out of many such—made by fallible men from documents which have been copied and recopied by many hands during many ages. But these men—copyists, printers, translators—received no gift of infallibility, and it were foolish to claim perfection for their work.

But those difficulties are no obstacles at all in the way of our accepting that same Bible as *substantially* what prophets and Apostles delivered from God so many generations ago. We have the highest authority—that of our Lord Himself—for saying that even the Old Testament is a faithful representation of that Word of God, and is binding upon us.

But, admitting all this, we may be told that this is but the fringe of the difficulties; that the difficulties are really such as these: First, that the contents of the Bible do not appear to point to a divine origin; for, to say nothing of such statements as are palpably inconsistent with science—as, *e.g.*, the account of the Creation—there are others as

¹ Job xxxviii. 31.

palpably inconsistent with common sense, such as the account of Balaam's ass and of the sun standing still at Joshua's command. Secondly, that the story of the Bible, taken as a whole, from a moral and metaphysical standpoint, is entirely inconsistent with the ideas of mercy and justice, of benevolence and Almighty power, and that in consequence men distinguished by scientific attainments and by brilliant ability, after careful inquiry into the evidences of its truth, are convinced that it is not divine. Here is an impeachment that in truth burns all the bridges behind.

What answer do we make to these objections?

1. Well, first of all, we object to its being taken for granted that all men of intelligence are against the Bible. If it were a question of authority, Christian men would have the advantage. The greatest scientific philosopher ever vouchsafed to the world was a fervent believer in God's Word. Sir Isaac Newton, whose marble statue in Westminster Abbey represents him as weighing the sun with the steelyard of his philosophy, proclaimed his belief that nature and scripture "are alike two books written by one and the same hand—the hand of the Living God." And Newton is but chief among ten thousand, a goodly

array. Herschel, first of astronomers ; John Milton, among the poets ; Agassiz, among the scientists ; Hugh Miller, among the geologists and most graceful among the writers ; Washington and Wellington among the soldiers ; Daniel Webster and William E. Gladstone among the statesmen, these and countless others have all been believers in God's Word.

2. Next, we say that the Bible has suffered from its friends. Most foolishly has it been forced by these to bear literal interpretations where none were meant. Because the Psalmist poetically asserted that God had made the round world so sure that it could not be moved, Galileo was compelled to deny that it did move ! Even Calvin thought that verse proved that the earth was at rest in the heavens ; and Columbus was charged with impiety for believing in the existence of land beyond the sea, since the prophets and evangelists were all clearly against him ! Yet why take such a verse literally, and not also this ?—"The stars in their courses fought against Sisera : " Or this : "The hills melted like wax in the presence of the Lord." Consistency, thou art a jewel ; sadly is thy presence needed here even in the camp of the faithful.

3. Moreover, the Bible was never intended to teach science or astronomy, or aught, indeed, but spiritual truths. What matters it therefore even if its language is not scientifically correct? We have only to remember that it is not a text-book of science, and every objection to it based upon such assumption falls harmlessly to the ground as an arrow against an iron-clad. Do we not, even now, speak to unlearned people in such language as they may best understand, without regard to mere technicalities?

4. But what of the incredible element in the Bible? There is no incredible element. Granted a God of infinite power, there is nothing in the Bible we could not believe if it were plainly stated on sufficient testimony.

The speaking of the prophet's ass is perhaps not really so very remarkable an instance of God's power as some others. We ourselves have often heard persons of very limited intelligence who have had in a large measure the gift of speech. Human speech is, in fact, not necessarily linked with intelligence of an high order. Even parrots can talk. Still, we are not at all sure that we are expected to believe that the ass spoke. Balaam, it has been suggested, as a superstitious augur,

would naturally give some interpretation to the cries of the animal, just as the later augurs of Rome did to the cackling of the sacred geese ; for, be it remembered, only from this soothsayer himself could this account have come.

Nor do we admit that the Bible states that at the command of Joshua the sun stood still ; for it simply states that the story to that effect “ is written in the Book of Jasher.” The “ Book of Jasher,” however, forms no part of the Scriptures. Nevertheless, if the evidence were conclusive in favor of a pause in the onward sweep of the universe, we should believe it. He who made the sun can do what He will, bidding it stand or move as He directs.

But *cui bono* ? After all it is but an incident in a plan of campaign. Every age has its battle field over religion. The doors of our Temple of Janus are rarely long shut. Continually the warning voice is heard—

“ Soldiers of Christ, arise,
And put your armor on ! ”

At such time the enemy crieth so, and the ungodly cometh on so fast, and their voices against all revealed religion are heard shouting from afar :

“Down with it! Down with it—even to the ground!”

To-day the *casus belli* may be this, to-morrow that. But there is no discharge in this war; the enemy is always in the field. Just now a science, falsely so called, a blind agnosticism and hopeless materialism, with their forces joined, have set themselves together in battle-array against the Word of God. A strange hate animates some, an unseen power goads them. They tell us they are confident of victory. But we are not anxious. All the powers of darkness can do nothing against the truth. Truth, like the strong mountains, may not be removed, but standeth fast forever. Enthroned where no mortal can touch her, we need tremble no more for her than for God. “The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, but the Word of God shall stand forever.”¹

The confidence of this new enemy astonishes us, as we can see nothing to justify it. Christians can always appeal to the fulfilled past as guaranteeing the promised future. They can show that types have been fulfilled, prophecies have come to pass. They rest on experience. They can say: “We know,” and out of that ground of certainty

¹ Isaiah xl. 8.

they cannot be cast. They are as men who, knowing that the tide has rolled in for thousands of years, doubt not at all, and cannot doubt, but that it will roll in again on the morrow; or as men who, knowing that thousands of harvests have been reaped, are sure that "while the earth remaineth, seedtime and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."¹

But to what do these scoffers point? Not to the past, surely. Glance for a moment backward at the past. Voltaire has been for long the foremost prophet of the men who are without God in the world—the patriarch, as he mockingly styled himself, of the holy philosophical Church. Unmindful of the risks that prophets run who do not set the fulfilment of their prophecies far enough in advance, he rashly predicted that in the nineteenth century the Bible would not be read, and added besides, that in one hundred years Christianity itself would have passed into history! We are now in the last decade of the nineteenth century—yet, so far is that prophecy from having been fulfilled, that, as by a strange Nemesis, Voltaire's own printing-press has been used for

¹ Gen. viii. 22.

printing Bibles, and his house is now a dépôt of the Geneva Bible Society!

The Bible not read in the nineteenth century! It is read even more than ever before. There are now more than eighty Bible societies in existence. One of these—the British and Foreign—last year printed no less than 3,000,000 copies. For every minute of the day and of the night all through the year, without a single pause, five copies of the Bible are sent forth by this one society alone. As the mighty Niagara, ever flowing on, is every day flinging millions of gallons into the St. Lawrence, so the streams of Divine Truth, even more mighty in volume and more resistless in power, are flowing over this sin-stained world. Every week chronicles some new triumph of the Word—among the latest of these being the recent grateful reception by the Dowager Empress of China of a copy of that Word translated into her own tongue, and its translation into the language of the Basukuma people, in Central Africa—the 320th language into which the Bible has been translated!

The Bible is daily being read more and more. Christianity has not passed into history, but Voltaire has. Not long after his death, the services

of the nurse of his dying hours were sought for in a similar case. "Is he a Christian?" was the ready question. "Yes, a faithful and true one. But why?" "Because I saw Voltaire die, and nothing on earth will induce me to witness another such death."

Far, however, from there being any visible prospects of its speedy disappearance, the Bible is to-day not only being more widely read and more widely circulated, but is daily coming to fill a larger space in business life and a surer place in the affections of mankind. And this in no small measure because we are beginning to know it better. We stood in need of this knowledge. It was a rude shock to many when the Revised Version first came out. They had thought of the writers of the Bible as simple amanuenses writing down from angelic dictation what God had said, just as the old artists loved to represent them, and every word was God's Word. But when that version revealed errors here and mistranslations there, the very foundations seemed to them thrown down. As soon, however, as they had recovered from their consternation, they saw clearly that it was not the Bible, but their own ideas of it, which needed revision. And now we hesitate not, in the

light of this new knowledge, to say that the more fully the Bible is known, the more distinctly is it seen to be the Word of God to man—a light to lighten man's feet and a lantern unto his path:

“ Lord, Thy Word abideth,
And our footsteps guideth ;
Who its truth believeth,
Light and joy receiveth.”

We once steamed up a deep inlet of the Atlantic Ocean into the Island of Newfoundland. The scenery was as grand and striking as that of a Norway fjord, and very similar. The inlet consisted of what appeared to be a succession of lakes. As the steamer passed into one after another, no outlet was visible beyond. Once within, there appeared to be a perfectly landlocked sheet of water. A few minutes' steaming, however, revealed an opening through which we presently glided, only to emerge upon the bosom of another lake, and to find ourselves in the midst of a similar scene. At last we reached the head, when all our difficulties were over. Simply going forward had solved them. They did not, in fact, exist. So with the Bible:—Go right on; take it for what it claims to be, not for what you have perhaps

made it in your own fertile imagination—and all will be well. Let men draw near in reverence, and in a spirit willing to learn, and the Book will do its own work. “The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him, and He will show them His covenant.”¹

¹ Ps. xxv. 14.

XII.

THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH

XII.

THE BIBLE IN THE CHURCH

“ A glory gilds the sacred page
Majestic as the sun :
It gives a light to every age,
It gives, but borrows none.”

—COWPER.

THERE are three very distinct theories with respect to the place of the Holy Scriptures in the Church.

I. FIRST, THE DENOMINATIONAL THEORY.—This is the theory held by such bodies of Christians as the Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the Baptists. In perfect accord, as one man, all these bodies will affirm, with Chillingworth: “The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.” To all such it is

“ The only star
By which the bark of man can navigate
The sea of life, and gain the court of bliss
Securely.”

They assume that in possession of a Bible, the Protestant Christian is fully competent to know God's will; henceforth he is independent of all human intervention; he needs neither priest nor Church to stand between him and God. Why should he? What can they tell him that he does not know? What offer him that he does not already possess? He fully believes, with Macaulay, that a Christian with the Bible in his hand in the nineteenth century, is in just as favorable a position for serving God as men have been at any time since Christ left this earth.

The ideas of such Christians as to what is "The Church" are not, of course, ours; and, we being the judges, they are not well founded. But whatever they may be, they are not intentionally in conflict with the Bible. To those who hold them, as the heaven is higher than the earth, so is the Bible higher than the Church. The Church is of man; the Bible is of God. The Church is imperfect; the Bible perfect. We summon here but one witness, a confessedly competent witness, and then we proceed. "This is the word of God,"¹ said the late C. H. Spurgeon; "come, search, ye critics, and find a flaw; examine it, from its Genesis to

¹ Sermons, vol. i., p. 31.

its Revelation, and find an error. This is a vein of pure gold, unalloyed by quartz, or any earthly substance. This is a star without a speck; a sun without a blot; a light without darkness; a moon without its paleness; a glory without dimness. O Bible! it cannot be said of any other book that it is perfect and pure; but of thee we can declare all wisdom is gathered up in thee, without a particle of folly. This is the judge that ends the strife, where wit and wisdom fail. This is the book untainted by any error; but is pure, unalloyed, perfect truth." No one can say that this trumpet gives an uncertain sound.

2. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC THEORY.—This is the exact opposite of the Protestant, for the existence of which we believe it to be largely responsible. Its teaching is that not the Bible, but the Church, is supreme; that the Bible holds only a secondary place in the economy of grace, as being but a partial and incomplete revelation of God's will to man. Yet the Roman Bible is larger than that in Protestant hands! It contains the Apocrypha, which the other does not. Yet, notwithstanding this apparent advantage, the Roman Church, still unsatisfied with Scripture, anathematizes all who hold Scripture to be a sufficient

revelation of God's will to man. It asserts that tradition is also necessary; and more than all, that whosoever will be saved must hear and obey the voice of the Living Church.

Ask what necessary things tradition tells us, and a Roman Cardinal, the famous Bellarmine, is ready with a list. But such a list, forsooth! *Ex uno disce omnia*. We are gravely informed that tradition was needed to tell us how women were saved under the law! What solemn trifling is this! An Atlantic liner, reversing its engines in mid-ocean to look for a drowning kitten, is, in comparison, an inspiring sight. A great Church brings out bell, book, and candle to condemn those who cannot be persuaded that a knowledge of such trifles is really necessary to salvation. Why, we could not have a more cogent argument than this to persuade men that Scripture is alone the one fount of all our spiritual knowledge.

3. THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC THEORY. This occupies the middle ground between the Denominational and the Roman, and nowhere is the *via media* between the two extremes of Denominationalism and Papalism more clearly seen than here.

This Church loves the Bible as much as the ex-

trement Protestant can ever love it. She delights to do it honor. She assigns it an exalted place in her Services, bringing it prominently forward, reading it publicly from end to end, providing that a considerable portion of it shall be read at every Service which she offers to God, making it the final Court of Appeal in all matters of faith, telling her children that they must look there for the authority for everything that she teaches, "so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."¹ She sends all inquirers "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."² No Protestant sect does more than this; nor, indeed, as much. Not one assigns such an honored place to the Word of God in any of its public Services as this Church assigns in every Service she renders.

On the other hand, however, the Church will not thrust the Bible into a place which it was never intended to fill. She cannot speak of it as

¹ Articles of Religion, Art. vi.—Prayer-Book, p. 557.

² Isaiah viii. 20.

the only religion of men. She is with the Roman Church upon that point. She cannot accept the denominational theory if she would. Holy Scripture is her child, which through a long life she has guarded with all a mother's care, and with all a mother's love. She is still its witness and keeper; but her life is not dependent upon it, any more than a mother's life is dependent upon her offspring. She is built, not upon the Book, but upon the Rock, our Blessed Lord Himself; and if a worse than Diocletian persecution should consume the Scriptures to-morrow, she would still hold intact the authority to teach the truth once for all committed to the saints, and in that teaching men would find that the Word of God lived on. Such, then, is the place of the Bible in our Anglo-Catholic Church.

Now, these three different theories as to the place of the Bible have had their marked effect upon the Christian bodies which respectively hold them, as well as on their treatment of the Bible itself. Mark the result of the Denominational theory among its followers. Refusing the help of the Church and relying only on themselves, many well-meaning Protestants have found apparently not merely things hard, but things im-

possible to understand in Holy Scripture, and they have in consequence let them severely alone. Others they have delighted in, but at the cost of the entire exclusion of these more difficult sayings. They have forgotten that "*all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."¹

We mentioned a while ago the late Mr. Spurgeon. No preacher in our day has continuously held through as many years so vast a congregation together. But his great power was not so much seen in his preaching as in his exposition of Scripture. Yet it has been said that never once, among all the expositions he gave, among all the sermons he preached, did he ever expound the words: "Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain they are retained."² Why? It was not because that is an obscure verse, easily overlooked; still less because all are agreed about its meaning. We are led to believe that the reason was, that

¹ 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

² S. John xx. 23.

on no conceivable, honest interpretation — and Spurgeon was honest—had that text any place in the Baptist exposition. That vast congregation did not receive its due proportion of teaching, because it would not. It was a textuist congregation, whose very existence depended upon the magnifying of certain prominent verses and the forgetfulness of others. Thus large sections of the Bible are left as unexplored regions to many of our separated brethren.

The effect of Roman teaching is precisely the same. Extremes here meet, as so often elsewhere. That, too, has belittled Scripture, though by the opposite process. The incorporation of what were at best but ecclesiastical writings, as part of the Divine Word (we speak of the Apocrypha), was the first step; and the acknowledgment of tradition as of equal authority was the next, which well prepared men for the final assertion of the supreme authority of every utterance of the Church, even when such utterance plainly contradicted the written word of God. For a second time in history men “had made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions.”¹ What this means let the following pa-

¹ Matt. xv. 6.

thetic story tell ; its singularly touching interest amply justifying the recital :

The Indians of Oregon, having heard that the white man had a Book, and that it was the Book of God, the Great Spirit, determined to send a deputation—two of the chief Sachems and two young braves—to St. Louis to ask for a copy. They travelled three thousand miles on their remarkable mission only to meet with disappointment, the two old men dying in that city ; the two younger nowhere meeting among its Roman Catholic population anyone who would further the great object of their journey, although treated everywhere with great kindness and courtesy. The farewell speech of one of the survivors, made in the Council-room of the American Fur Company, is one of the most touching pieces of Indian eloquence on record. “I came to you,” he said, “over a trail of many moons from the setting sun. You were the friends of my fathers, who have all gone the long way. I came with one eye partly opened, for more light for my people, who sit in darkness. I go back with both eyes closed. How can I go back blind to my blind people? I made my way to you with strong arms, through many enemies and strange lands, that I might carry

much to them. I go back with both arms broken and empty. The two fathers who came with us—the braves of many winters and wars—we leave asleep here by your great water and wigwam. They were tired in many moons and their moccasins wore out. My people sent me to get the white man's Book of Heaven. You took me where you allow your women to dance, as we do not ours, and the Book was not there. You took me where they worship the Great Spirit with candles, and the Book was not there. You showed me the images of good spirits and pictures of the good land beyond, but the Book was not among them to tell us the way. I am going back the long sad trail to my people of the dark land. You make me feel heavy with burdens of gifts, and my moccasins will grow old in carrying them, but the Book is not among them. When I tell my poor blind people, after one more snow, in the big council, that I did not bring the Book, no word will be spoken by our old men nor by our young braves. One by one they will rise up and go out in silence. My people will die in darkness and they will go on the long path to the other hunting ground. No white man will go with them, and no white man's

Book to make the way plain. I have no more words."

Mark, however, the effect of the theory of the Anglican-Catholic Church. She stands to-day as she has always stood, for an open Bible.

In the old Parish Church at Chelsea, in London, the church in which Sir Thomas More was buried; in whose rectory Charles Kingsley grew to manhood, destined to be a Canon of Westminster, a poet, a novelist, and many things beside; in the graveyard of which rests Woodfall, the publisher of the "Letters of Junius;" the church beside which Carlyle, the Sage of Chelsea, lived his life, there is chained a copy of the scarce "Vinegar Bible," so named because of the misprint "Parable of the Vinegar," instead of "Parable of the Vineyard." That old Bible is itself a parable, telling its story of how the Church has always loved to set up its open Bible,

"Plain for all folk to see."

But mindful of what one has read about the Bible being hidden away, of what we have been told in an eminently dramatic way about Luther in Germany unexpectedly finding a copy of the word of God, we ask, did our Church in pre-Reformation

days love an open Bible, as she undoubtedly does now, or did she hide it away, as men once hid the Apocrypha? Read some books, and they tell us she did; read others, and they say she did not. Can both be right? We believe that, rightly understood, they can.

The national Church of England was ever a Bible-loving Church; but we must not forget that when her Roman sister held her in bondage they became so closely identified with each other as often to be regarded as one and the same.

He who will bear these facts in mind will have no difficulty in reconciling these apparently contradictory accounts. He will see then how there ever came to be such discordant notes in a Church which claimed the famous Columba, whose missionary life was in a mysterious way solely due to his earnest desire to possess a copy of the word of God; a Church whose devoted son, the venerable Bede, heard the Master's word "It is finished," while he was translating S. John's Gospel, and laid down his pen and his life together; whose King Alfred, most loyal of sons, held it as his dearest wish that "all the free-born youths of England should employ themselves on nothing until they could first read well the English Script-

tures;" whose famous Rector of Lutterworth, John Wyclif, the morning-star of the Reformation, translated the whole of the New Testament and half the Old; whose William Tyndale, Greek scholar and man mighty in the Scriptures, set it as the purpose of his life to "one day make the boy who drives the plough in England know more of Scripture than the Pope does;" a Church which after Tyndale's death set up Tyndale's Bible in every parish in the land; which had so taught the youthful King Edward VI. to value the Word of God, that he said, when at his coronation the swords were delivered to him as King of England, France, and Ireland: "There is yet another sword to be delivered to me, I mean the Sacred Bible, which is the sword of the Spirit, and without which we are nothing, neither can we do anything;" a Church which greeted with a Bible his sister Elizabeth in open procession, and finally gave us that authorized version, of which this is the testimony of an erring son, "It lives on the ear like music that can never be forgotten; like the sound of church bells which the convert scarcely knows how he can forego; it is part of the national mind, and the anchor of the national seriousness; it is the representative of a man's best moments;

all that there has been about him of soft and gentle and pure and penitent and good speaks to him forever out of his English Bible."

It was not of the will of the Anglican Church to hide the word of God, but of her foreign sister. The Anglican loved, the Roman feared that Word. But so closely were they for a while bound together that they seemed but one—but in that one there appeared to be a double personality—a Dr. Jekyll and a Mr. Hyde. But, unlike Stevenson's well-known story, the Jekyll triumphed. An open Bible has ever been the possession of the Anglican Church. But as in the story, so in the history; there were in England times when the Hyde got the upper hand, when mutilations and burnings were the order of the day; and again times when the true man appeared and there was peace. Let that fanciful story illustrate our meaning.

It was Jekyll fighting for God's word; it was Hyde digging up Wyclif's bones and burning them, for that he had "made the Scriptures common and more open to laymen and to women than it was wont to be to clerks well learned and of good understanding, so that the pearl of the Gospel was trodden under the foot of swine." It was Hyde that sentenced those found reading Wyclif's

translation to be burned with copies of it round their necks, and that smiled to see Christ's noblest in their agony: Hyde, that strangled Tyndale at the stake. It was Jekyll that was translating, copying, printing, and spreading that Word broadcast.

But as the bright, blue, clear Rhone conquers the thick yellow Arve, so Jekyll conquered Hyde and an open Bible was the result. And to-day our Church is emphatically the Church of the Bible. She reads it through and through, and hesitates not to rest the proof of her own claims to be indeed commissioned by Almighty God, on the evidences she can collect from its pages. There is no Church which has done more for scholarship than she has, but she turns from the works of the greatest of her sons to the Word which she received, not from man, but from God. She welcomes tradition and all the teachings of the Fathers, but only as illustrating that Word and making its meaning clearer. She welcomes the Apocrypha and writes it on "the blank page," between the Old and New Testaments, reading it sometimes in the Church as she does Canonical Scripture, yet not to establish any doctrine, but only for instruction in life and manners. She is

sound in her loyalty to the One Book of God. She will allow nothing to enter into rivalry or competition with it :

“ The Church from her dear Master,
Received the gift Divine,
And still that light she lifteth
O'er all the earth to shine.”

XIII.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

XIII.

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

“What! Prayer by the book? and common?

Yes. Why not?

The spirit of grace

And supplication,

Is not left free alone

For time and place;

But manner too. To read or speak by rote

Is all alike to him that prays

With 's heart, that with his mouth he says.”

—HERBERT.

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS tells us of the extreme disappointment with which he first beheld Raphael's famous picture of the Transfiguration. It was only as he came to look at it again and again that the picture grew upon him, until he saw clearly the handiwork of genius. Not at first did he realize its worth.

Just so does the Prayer-Book grow upon us. Not until we have come close to it do we per-

ceive the sweetness of its harmonies, or the greatness of its soul-uplifting powers. Till then it is as a sealed book. We cannot do with it as we do with mountain scenery—admire it at a great distance; we must draw near to it; we must pray its prayers and drink of its spirit; then its beauties and its comforts, all hidden before, will start out into glittering brilliance. As one looking up into the heavens on a clear night, perceives at first few only of the stars, but, continuing to gaze, sees at last that the heavens are all ablaze with light, so one looking at this book gradually sees one bright jewel after another flashing on his sight, until the whole becomes as a coal of living fire from the Altar of God!

Here, indeed, is the secret of the eventual breakdown of all opposition to the Prayer-Book. Years ago opposition was strong and widespread. But now it is dying out, and all because the book is becoming better known. Even many who once made war on it have come over to us. Two facts reveal this:

(1) Ministers of non-liturgical congregations are on all sides, in their public prayers and services, making large drafts on this book, both for inspiration and for language; nor are they any

longer afraid to yield it unstinted praise. And their people love to have it so. Not many years ago, to the great delight of the congregation in a certain Scottish Presbyterian kirk, Sunday by Sunday, was said, all from memory, the beautiful Litany of the Episcopal Church.

(2) Non-liturgical communities are themselves now openly taking to the use of some sort of prayer-books. This new departure is to some among them a grief of mind. But they are powerless; and no Jenny Geddes will arise in her might to tread the war-path against the bringers-in of these hateful book-prayers! True, these prayers are not always word for word with ours. But, all the same, the Church can say with Tennyson—only with her it is a real cause of rejoicing that she can so truly say—

“ Once in a golden hour
I cast to earth a seed,
Up there came a flower—
The people said a weed.

“ To and fro they went
Thro’ my garden-bower,
And, muttering discontent,
Cursed me and my flower.

“ Then it grew so tall
It wore a crown of light ;
But thieves from o’er the wall
Stole the seed by night :

“ Sowed it far and wide,
By every town and tower,
Till all the people cried,
‘ Splendid is the flower.’

“ Read my little fable ;
He that runs may read.
Most can raise the flowers now,
For all have got the seed.”

The true Christian Church has never been without a Prayer-Book, or, as it was anciently called, a Liturgy. She had one (pardon the Hibernianism) before it was written. But in very truth, unwritten for 300 years, the Church yet possessed a Liturgy. She had, that is to say, fixed forms of prayer, which were as faithfully preserved by memory and practice as if they had been written down with ink and with pen. In this respect we fear some so-called extemporaneous prayers are but book-prayers, after all. We remember a typical instance. A venerable Scotch clergyman of the older school on meeting one of his parishion-

ers, kindly inquired after her health. "I'm unco wake and my mind's clean gane," was the reply. "I am sorry to hear that, woman," said the minister; "the want of memory is a great affliction; ye ken I can well sympathize with you in it, for I've suffered greatly in that way mysel' for a long time." "Eh, sir, hoo can ye say that, when I've heard ye gi'e the same prayer noo for ower sax-an'-twenty year, an' ye ha'ena forgotten a word o't—no' ane."

It was not that the early Christians had any scruples against written prayers. They well knew that the Jewish Church had for ages used such prayers; that Christ himself had joined in them and had used them also; and that when His Apostles asked for a form, he immediately gave them one. But the same feeling which caused them to refrain from committing their creed to writing, was ever present. They feared lest those prayers might fall into the hands of the heathen; and always before their eyes were Christ's warning words: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you."¹ So, not until persecution had ceased and this danger had passed away, could

¹ St. Matt. vii. 6.

written forms of prayer appear; then they came as naturally as night follows day. This was, however, not until the beginning of the fourth century. Then we find that four distinct liturgies were in existence—all, however, so closely resembling one another as manifestly to be the offspring of one common stock. These were, (1) that of the Eastern Church, now known as the Oriental Liturgy, which prevailed from the Hellespont, and from thence to the southern extremity of Greece, across to the Euphrates; (2) that of Alexandria, used in Egypt, Abyssinia, and the countries westward along the Mediterranean Sea; (3) that of Rome, which prevailed in Italy and along the North African coast; (4) and finally the Gallican, which, it is thought, prevailed throughout Gaul, Spain, and Britain. This much for prayer-books in general.

Here however we may leave the general history of Prayer-Books to follow the fortunes of our own in Britain and in America. Prayer-Book history, as it concerns ourselves, may be grouped into three separate epochs:

1. Extending from the first preaching of the Gospel in Britain to the Reformation.
2. From the Reformation to the beginning

of our own independent and national American life.

3. From then to the present time.

Of the four ancient liturgies the Gallican was probably—if we may borrow a term familiar to us in our own phraseology—the standard Prayer-Book of Britain. But it was not destined to be without a rival. When the Italian missionary, Augustine, arrived in A.D. 597, he brought with him the book then used at Rome and on the African coast

“Fronting Italy and the mouth of the Tiber.”

This book Augustine urged the British Bishops to accept in place of their own. It was, he said, S. Peter's. But they had no mind to make such exchange. Their own Book had the authority of S. John and S. Paul, and in the judgment of British Christians those Apostles were not a whit behind S. Peter himself. And to the British much more than S. Peter could ever be, for the seal of their Apostleship were they in the Lord. So clinging with Naboth like fervor to the inheritance of their fathers, they refused the proffered gift. Mortified beyond measure, Augustine returned to his work in Kent among the heathen

Saxons. Neither he nor his and they ever met again; yet as time wore on, and the people of Kent, who, taught by Augustine, had become Christians and were using his Liturgy, met with the people of the old book of the land, prejudice wore away, and soon the two forms of Liturgical Service which had so long existed side by side were merged together, and became the standard Prayer-Book of a united National Church.

We must, however, guard against misapprehension. Our illustration is not altogether perfect. This standard book of mediæval Christianity was far from being the equivalent of the modern Prayer-Book. It was merely the nucleus of it, containing but little besides the Service of the Communion. Around it other books of lesser importance revolved like satellites around the sun. But they were not directly of it. These were the Breviary, containing a series of daily services; the Manual, containing the Baptismal and other occasional Offices which might be performed by a priest; and the Pontifical, with services which the bishop might alone administer. Yet they were all in structure and general tone the same, but the Missal—the Communion Service—was always the model of them all.

These books, however, had no one custodian. Every bishop, according to primitive custom, regulated the services of the Church in his own diocese without let or hindrance; he added to the standard or took away, as he thought well. A uniformly standard Prayer-Book under such circumstances was manifestly impossible. Yet the variations were not so great as one might suppose. All acknowledged that a Liturgy derived from an Apostle should not be greatly altered. Still these variations were such as finally to create well-established uses or customs. Thus there was the Use of Bangor, the Use of Hereford, of Lincoln, of York, and the most popular and most widely known of all the Use of Sarum or Salisbury.

Yet a likeness to the common original ran through all these Uses or Prayer-books. Those mediæval bishops were true, consciously or unconsciously, to the law of unity of type. "By unity of type,"¹ says Darwin, "is meant the fundamental agreement in structure which we see in organic beings of the same class, and which is given to them independent of their habits of life."

¹ Darwin, *Origin of Species*, p. 166.

They who from time to time made changes from the common standard were—

“So careful of the type,”

that it has been said that, if S. John, during the celebration of the Holy Communion, could visit one of our own churches in this nineteenth century, he would feel perfectly at home, and could readily take his part in the service. Perhaps then, the legend of the Seven Sleepers of Ephesus would be seen to be nearer the truth than we had thought, and to be no legend at all, but sober reality, for after eighteen centuries a Bishop of Ephesus—the greatest the city of Diana ever had—hearing once again the old prayers, might even think himself back again where he had once ruled as bishop.

Thus, while the theme was harmonious, these mediæval Uses upon Uses began to produce great confusion: and so a cry for simpler services and simpler books was raised everywhere. This cry was indeed a principal cause of the Reformation. Intelligible simplicity was the great need of the hour, and the Church nobly undertook to meet the demand. Cranmer was the principal editor of the revised Book of Common

Prayer. But the task was great. Before him lay a vast mass of Missals, Breviaries, Manuals, and Pontificals from almost every Diocese in England, and from Rome and the Continent—their number seemed legion. And they were all in Latin which had long been “a tongue not understood of the people.”¹

As we contemplate this chaotic mass, one question forces itself upon us. How would the good people of these days, whose gorge rises at the sight of some small deviation from established usage, have vexed their righteous souls had they lived then? Yet, almost from the traditional preaching of S. Paul until the eve of the Reformation, such chaos existed in Britain. Surely not carping criticism, but deep thankfulness, should be ours to-day that this chaos is ended.

The demand then was for a standard book which, purged from mediæval accretions and error, should be in the vulgar tongue and be intelligibly simple. It was not authors, but editors, translators and compilers, that were in request. Not a new prayer was called for; not a new service required. Had either been proposed, men would have said, “the old is better.” All they

¹ Articles of Religion, Art. XXIV.—Prayer-Book, p. 562.

asked was simplicity. Their old prayers, like old friends, suited them best. With this formal demand made and complied with, the first great *epoch* of our Prayer-Book draws to its close.

The second epoch opens in 1544. Then, by the translation into the vernacular of the Litany, a great forward movement was made. It was an auspicious beginning. In the year 1547 the Epistles and Gospels were appointed to be said. The Holy Communion Service in English followed the next year. This work proceeded until all the Services; for the Communion, for Baptism, Burial, and other special Offices, were finally prepared, and the whole English book was ready for publication in the second year of the reign of the young king, Edward VI. On January 12, 1549, the Act for "Uniformity of Service and Administration of the Sacraments throughout the Realm" had been passed by Parliament, having previously been adopted by Convocation. Thus all demands were met. An English Prayer-Book, simple, scriptural, and complete, was now the property of the English Church. By a happy omen, "on the Feast of the Pentecost next coming," which that year fell on June 9th, the book was first used. Most appropriately indeed was all this done on

that festival which commemorates the outpouring of God's Holy Spirit, when men first heard the good news of the Gospel in their own tongue in which they were born.

Known as Edward's First Book because four years afterward another appeared, it has never been entirely superseded. The second, unconstitutionally put forth, was scarcely issued before the young King died. Then both first and second were promptly consigned by Queen Mary to the flames. Later on, in the reign of Elizabeth, the second book, with some material alterations and additions was restored and became the Prayer-Book of the English Church.

No true Churchman, we believe, has ever regretted the disappearance of that second book in its original form. It stood for bald Puritanism in faith and practice and was the result of panic legislation. It was not the work of English Churchmen, but of German and Swiss Calvinists. But would we had never lost the First! It is perhaps not too much to say that, having regard to all for which a prayer-book stands, no prayer-book equal to that has ever before or since seen the light of day. Even to this day English Churchmen are sent to that book as their

final authority ; for the only ritual directions the English Church now has are contained in the famous "ornaments rubric:" *And here it is to be noted that such ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth.*

That Prayer-Book is ours ; hence all we have said. While this land was a colony of Great Britain, the Church of the Mother Country crossed the Atlantic to minister to her scattered children in this New World. But when the Colony became the Republic, the Colonial Church at once became the Church of the Nation. No longer now the Church of England *in* America, she had become the Church of America.

It was then, to use the words which you will find in the Preface to our Prayer-Book, that "the attention of this Church was in the first place drawn to those alterations in the Liturgy which became necessary in the prayers for our civil rulers in consequence of the Revolution." The book had, of course, necessarily to be amended. Of the result of this work we will let

the revisers speak for themselves in the words of that Preface. "It seems unnecessary," said they, "to enumerate all the different alterations and amendments. They will appear, and it is hoped the reasons of them also, upon a comparison of this with the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. In which it will also appear that this Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require." This Preface is our own "ornaments rubric"—the only one we have—but it will be seen that it is practically the same as the English Church possesses. We may be thankful to have it. Remove it, and "there is no law." It is, for example, the universal custom for our Clergy to be vested with surplice and stole. But why not a black coat and white tie, or something less conventional still? What is there, unless good taste shall say nay, to prevent some other costume being adopted in the chancel and the pulpit? There is not a word about a surplice in the Book. Custom, you say? Unfortunately, custom is untrustworthy. A few years ago one saw only long black stoles, and surplices even longer. But the stoles of to-day are red and

purple and white and green, and the surplices are not as heretofore. No; custom will not suffice, for it is as fickle as fashion.

The ornaments rubric is our only court of appeal. Upon that we take our stand. It carries us back to Edward's days, and authorizes for use now what was in use then, and forbids now what was forbidden then; and it does more—it shows most clearly that there has in all these years been no break in continuity; the Church that has crossed an ocean, is still one with the Church on the other side.

Of late a deeper interest has been awakened in this old Prayer-Book of ours. Wide-spread Prayer-Book distribution has become a feature in the Church's life and work to-day. The adaptiveness of this book as a manual for the missionary in his work, for the Christian in his life, for the people in their worship, for the ministry in its office, for the nation, and for the Catholic Church, is rapidly becoming manifest to all; as more than all else the pure form of sound words, that good thing committed unto us by the Holy Ghost.

The Scottish people, it is said, value beyond all others three books: The Bible, Pilgrim's Progress, and Fox's Book of Martyrs. Let it be said

of the American people that they also have books they value beyond all others that have ever been written: The Bible and the Prayer-Book. The Bible first, the Prayer-Book next.

XIV.

THE PRAYER-BOOK IN THE CHURCH

XIV.

THE PRAYER-BOOK IN THE CHURCH

“ More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of.”

—TENNYSON.

AN old Church has, as we have seen, an old Prayer-Book—and everyone of the Church's sons rejoices to think of it as old ; as the Prayer-Book of Andrewes and Butler, of Ken and Laud, of Wyclif and Anselm, of Langton and Theodore and Aidan, of Alfred and Bede and Augustine, those saintly heroes of the past whom we know by name, and whose memories we treasure ; as also of that greater multitude whose names we know not, but who, well known to God, “ have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.”¹

Almost identically as it is now, the Church has had this book for over three hundred years, and

¹ Rev. vii. 14.

in one form or another she has possessed and used its material for some fifteen hundred years more. It is the heritage of the ages. After her pure sacraments and her open Bible, her ancient faith and catholic order, she values her book of Common Prayer more than all else besides. Many and beautiful buildings belong to her. Noble churches and stately cathedrals, some so exquisitely beautiful that it seems almost as if the solid rock had blossomed into flower. But without a sigh she would part with them all if she had to choose between them and her Prayer-Book. To her that book is as daily bread. Not at long intervals but every day does she use it. Its history has been largely her history ; its fortunes her fortunes. It has indeed so entered into her life that in these latter days she and the book have seemed to be indispensable to each other, and she has in consequence become known, from one end of a wide sphere of influence to the other, as the Church of the Prayer-Book.

But why is this book so much to her? What is its place in her system? The Church herself stands for the sum total of revealed truth, for all organized Christianity, for unity in faith and work, for spiritual guidance, for a voice from

God, for the means of salvation. For what does the Prayer-Book stand? We answer:

I. FOR TRUE CATHOLICISM,—which is the middle ground between Denominationalism and Papalism. The true Churchman alone is the true Catholic. Not indeed that he is not a Protestant also,—even as were our ancestors who delighted to style themselves “Protestant Catholics.” But he is a Catholic first of all, and more than all. The Church’s Creed binds him to Catholicism. He there professes faith, not in a Holy Protestant, still less in a “Holy Roman,” but in “the Holy Catholic Church.”

Nor is this a question of words and names. The essence of Protestantism is the right of every man to resist unscriptural innovations. The perversion of this is the assumed right to believe what he will. When Cardinal Vaughan said that he was not prepared to see Protestants *en masse* accepting papal infallibility, inasmuch as every Protestant was his own Pope, he was in a measure right. To the denominational Protestant there can be no other Pope because he claims that there is no authority outside of himself which can direct him in matters of religion. He knows not the Church as such an authority. It is, ac-

according to him, a mere delusion to imagine that she is such. There is indeed, in his judgment, and he speaks as one having authority, no organized visible Church at all. Now, Protestantism of itself is no more an adequate description of the Christian life than an account of our late Civil War would be a faithful representation of American life, or of the forces which have made America great.

The essence of Papalism, on the other hand, is the absolute denial of every individual right whatsoever. Papalism perverts the supremacy of the Church into the supremacy of one man; for Cardinal Cajetan has told us that the Church is the bond slave of the Papacy. Should even a man's conscience condemn him, he must yet obey the Church. The Church is in fact to a man, as Joseph was to the Egyptians, in place of God; and can anyone doubt but that he ought to obey God rather than man!

But the Church is both truly Catholic and truly Protestant; for the two ideas are inseparable. Holding this truth she declares that the denominationalists are so far right in believing in the supremacy of conscience. She, too, teaches that the last authority in matters of faith is within,

not without, a man. Not in the Bible, nor yet in the Church, but in himself does a man find that voice from which there is no appeal. A man must to his own self be true. It is only so that he can hear God's voice at all.

But again coming forward she confesses that the Roman Catholic is also right in exalting the Church, believing in her and revering her, holding that she has a divine mission here. She moreover solemnly affirms that short of that point where conscience whispers "obedience is sin," she has paramount authority. To seek her help and guidance, to yield loving obedience, to follow with a glad mind her godly admonitions in all things short of this great alternative, is the churchman's duty. In place of this obedience she can accept nothing; not alms, not zeal, not great sacrifices. Her word is: "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."¹

For this, then, the Prayer-Book stands; for the right of a Church to speak and teach with all authority,—consistent at once with the supremacy of the conscience and with the voice of the Church as recorded in Holy Scripture, or to be

¹ 1 Sam. xv. 22.

proved thereby; confidently believing that it will never be found that these can differ. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."

2. NEXT, THE PRAYER-BOOK STANDS FOR THE OFFICIAL UTTERANCE of the Church on ritual and doctrine. It is her standard of faith and worship. In it we "hear the Church." It is true Catholicism applied in practice. Concerning the teaching of the Church, it is often said that it is all so contradictory that men know not what to believe. One voice goes forth among us here in America or from Canterbury, another from Rome, and yet a third from Moscow; and that in consequence the ordinary layman is left in a quandary. Which of these voices shall he hear? All, we answer, are without signification, save that of his own Church. Is he an American who asks this? We reply: In our Prayer-Book. But that, too, we shall be told, lacks uniformity, and is indefinite and contradictory.

In his "Faith of Our Fathers" Cardinal Gibbons makes an attack upon our Church, based on this view.¹ To him this Church is a medley of contradictory teachings. He imagines, as a case in point, a bishop ordaining a young man to the priesthood

¹ Cf. Faith of Our Fathers, Eleventh Edition, 1879, p. 408.

with the solemn words: "Whosoever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins ye retain, they are retained;" and then immediately after the service giving the young priest to understand that he must not take these words seriously, as they are but a mere figure of speech, and mean nothing !

Now, we might fairly say that no merely hypothetical case can rightly claim our attention. The world is too full of great questions and real problems, and life is too short, to justify our fighting shadows. Still, we will assume that such a case has actually occurred. What then can we say? Why, surely this: that no Church can be judged by the eccentricities of any disloyal member. Would the Cardinal desire that his own Church should thus be so judged? We trow not. Yet, after putting himself on record in this way he ought to be prepared for it. "For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again."¹

The charge is one of inconsistency. Well, some of us may have been inconsistent, but at least we have not gone the length of giving Bibles to candidates for confirmation in Maryland, and refus-

¹ Luke vi. 38.

ing earnest petitions to be allowed to read them in Ireland and elsewhere;¹ we have not, in one ward of an American city, forbidden our clergy under pains and penalties to marry, and in another have allowed them; we have not in some places forbidden people to have service in a tongue which they understand, teaching that Latin alone was the sacred language of prayer, and permitting it to them elsewhere; we have not sanctioned² marriages between uncles and nieces in return for a weighty payment, and afterward boasted of the sacred strictness of our marriage laws. We have not two oaths for our Bishops—one for the use of such as are consecrated abroad, and one for the use of those consecrated within the United States—one binding the Bishop who takes it to persecute and attack heretics and schismatics, the other without it,³ because, forsooth, her use of it here would bring the Church into discredit with

¹ See p. 227 of this book.

² Vide Foster's *Peerage*, 1831, p. 9, foot-note, title Acton, "— having married in 1796 (by dispensation of the Pope) Mary Anne, elder daughter of his [younger] brother, General Joseph Edward Acton (she was born in 1782)." In this case dispensation was given to a man of sixty to marry his niece aged only fourteen!

See also the more recent case of the Duke of Aosta.

³ In the discussion between the Rev. Thomas Vickers and the Roman Archbishop Purcell, in Cincinnati, in 1867, Mr. Vickers wrung from the archbishop the reluctant admission that for *American* Roman bishops

every right-minded person in the land, and in Maryland, at all events, dispose more effectually of her grotesque claim to be the author of the Act of Toleration. And we have our reward. None have ever charged us with trickiness, with hunting with the hare and running with the hounds. We have never even been charged with that fault which the whole world knows as Jesuitry. Eccentric and disloyal members we may have, who, either in the direction of Roman superstition or Puritan innovation, have erred and are teaching men so. But what of that? We call no man lord. What says the Book? By that we are willing to be judged, and by that only will we be condemned.

Inconsistency may be the result of having no settled standard of faith and practice, or may be an offence against discipline and organization. In our case it cannot be due to the first, for we have a clear and authoritative utterance on doctrine and worship. In the Book of Common Prayer it is enshrined; and that book is no more responsible for disloyalty than the barque on the ocean is re-

the "Episcopal oath" does not contain the obnoxious clause, "I will persecute and attack heretics, schismatics," etc. (*hæreticos schismaticos . . . pro posse persequar et impugnabo*).

sponsible for the storms which sweep around it, or for the faithful discharge of their duty by its crew.

The book is one and the same for all her children, wherever found. And to the loyal son its prayers and services, its teachings and rules are so clear that he cannot mistake them. We once heard of a clergyman who had the reputation of being invisible during the week and incomprehensible on Sunday. But it could only have been in the pulpit that he was incomprehensible, for it was the remark of one who knew him: "Yes, Doctor X—— is hazy; but oh, those prayers out of that book of his—there is nothing hazy about them."

3. IT IS THE CHRISTIAN'S MANUAL OF DEVOTION. Observe its system:

"Distinct with signs, thro' which, in set career,
As thro' a zodiac, moves the ritual year."

All the doctrines of the faith, and all the great historical facts on which that faith so largely rests, are here in order brought before us. Around the person of our Lord all revolves, and in his mighty resurrection from the dead all culminates.

Beginning with Advent, this ritual year leads us at once to Christmas, when we think of Christ's fulfilment of ancient prophecy, and there we see, in very truth, Immanuel—God with us: then, one after another, come the great events in our Saviour's life, his miracles and parables, his holy, spotless example, his suffering, death, and Resurrection, and so we tread the pathway of growing knowledge and deepening faith, till we learn of the Holy Ghost and the ever blessed Trinity.

Then, too, we see how that gently as a mother cares for her little ones, so does the Church in this Prayer-Book deal with us. Milk for babes; strong meat for men; this is her method. Taking us as infants a few days old, she baptizes us; then, as our minds develop, she trains us in the simplest matters of our holy religion, in the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments; then strengthens us by Confirmation; then feeds us in the Holy Communion with angel's food, and at last, when she has thus watched over us through life, she buries us, with all our faults forgotten, covering us with the robe of that boundless "charity which hopeth all things, endureth all things, believeth all things."¹

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 7.

And all this in the very words with which fifty generations of Christians have nourished their souls and drawn nearer to God.

The Prayer-Book which is thus the Church's standard, is necessarily her missionary also—silent, but powerful like the Word of God itself, and sharper than any two-edged sword. "It is," said Dr. Adam Clarke, the learned and distinguished Methodist commentator, "the greatest effort of the Reformation next to the translation of the Bible. As a form of devotion it has no equal in any part of the Universal Church. Next to the Bible, it is the book of my understanding and of my heart." Would that it were such to all the scattered children of the Church!

XV.

THE HYMNAL
OR BOOK OF COMMON PRAISE

XV.

THE HYMNAL

OR BOOK OF COMMON PRAISE

“Si quaeris Deo placere, quanto cantabis simplicius, tanto magis ei placebis.”—S. BONAVENTURA.

THE Church, in all her public services, restricts her clergy and congregations to the forms laid down in the Book of Common Prayer. Her practice in this matter is rigid. Even when Morning and Evening Prayer have been duly rendered, if a third Service is held it must be in the words of that Book. That is the mine from which the material must be quarried; the channel through which must flow the streams of prayer and praise welling up from grateful hearts.

Now in this the Church maintains a principle. It is that she is responsible, not only for the general conduct, but for all the details of Divine Service. Individual action, with its occasional idiosyncracies, its little oddities and eccentricities,

which in some spheres she loves to tolerate and even to encourage, here obtains no place or sanction. Yet this is not tyranny. The very thought that it is will die away ere it finds expression in word, if we remember what the Church is. Is it not ourselves? "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular:"¹—"the Temple of the Lord are we." Churchmen, if they wished another law, might have another, but they do not wish it. The reign of law is for them perfect liberty.

But a Church which asserts this principle must be consistent. A Book of Common Prayer implies a Book of Common Praise. Clergy and people under law in the use of prose, may well beg not to be left a law unto themselves in the use of sacred song. Where, then, would be safety? Error carefully excluded in one way might find entry in another. Without an authorized Hymnal the Church would be conducting her affairs as one who should look carefully to the fastenings of his doors at night yet leave the windows wide open. A hymn has often greater teaching power than a prayer. In the hands of Arius and other false teachers it was once a powerful

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 27.

medium for the spread of false doctrine, and can easily become so again ; or it can be, on the other hand, a great means for the spread of the truth. Better, indeed, from this point of view, that the Church should leave to an irresponsible individualism the framing of services and the making of prayers than the choice and use of hymns. Tempted to do otherwise, she might learn a lesson from him who said : " Let me write the songs of a people, and I care not who makes their laws." So let the Church say what hymns shall be sung, and she will find she need not be careful about aught else.

Rightly, then, does our Church possess a Hymnal. In this respect our American Church stands far ahead of the Church of England, which has no official hymn-book. Not that the people of that Church do not think they need one ; they acknowledge that they do. The longing desire of one of her loyal sons, not long since, found vent in these words : " Would to God that the Church would give, without delay, all that is needed in the way of more offices and all that is needed in the way of a Book of Common Praise ! Some serious troubles await the Church. With an enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer, with

common-sense adaptations to modern needs, and a really comprehensive Book of Common Praise, she might deal with them all, and come forth better, holier, and brighter than ever." The very thought of such a possession would be to them delightful. But their time has not yet come. Not until when, without effort and without party feeling, there can be a hymn-book, which in all its teachings shall be in harmony with their Prayer-Book, can that be.

Meanwhile, practically, there is a standard book in England—a book which has quietly and without official patronage been steadily pressing forward into public favor, until it can now almost claim to be the chosen Hymnal of the Anglican Communion. This is the compilation usually known as "Hymns, Ancient and Modern." The extent to which this Hymnal is used appears from a report just issued by a Joint Committee of the two houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, wherein it is shown that

Hymns, Ancient and Modern, are used in 10,340 churches.

Hymnal Companion in.....	1,478	"
Church Hymns in.....	1,462	"
Various.....	379	"
	<hr/>	
	13,659	

In the American Church we have passed through the embryo stage. Along with her standard Bible and Prayer-Book, *our* Church has her Book of Common Praise. We may be thankful for this. The book selected may not be the best. But a liturgical Church is committed to an official Hymn-Book. Concerning the value of the book itself, opinions may differ. In a collection of six hundred and seventy-nine hymns, we may expect to find hymns of varying merit. And we undoubtedly shall. Besides the grandest and most sublime compositions we have some with no more poetry in them than has a proposition of Euclid. Some are not even true to the ideal of what a hymn should be. Yet we may rejoice that we have a book of hymns which has received the sanction of our Church. And in any case let us remember how great an improvement it registers.

In 1640 the first Hymn-Book printed in America appeared. It was "The Psalms in Metre, Faithfully Translated for the Use, Edification, and Comfort of the Saints, in Public and Private, especially in New England." "If," say the translators, "our verses are not always so smooth and elegant as some may desire and expect, let them consider that God's altar needs not our polishings."

The two following verses may serve to show how little polishing had been done :

“ The Lord’s song sing can wee, being
In stranger’s land? then let
Lose her skill my right hand if I
Jerusalem forget.

“ Let cleave my tongue my pallate on
If mind thee doe not I,
If chiefe joyes o’er I prize not more
Jerusalem my joy.”

Among the translators and versifiers of this elegant New England Psalter, was John Elliott, the Apostle of the Indians. Yet, notwithstanding the spell of Elliott’s name, we may be thankful we have nothing like this now !

What is the object of the hymn writer, and why do we sing hymns?

1. To teach men about God.

This Church is a teaching Church. This teaching is primarily conveyed by means of collects and portions of Scripture. A Hymn-Book of the Church ought to conform itself to the mind of the Church and follow her example in this respect. But the Churchmanship of to-day is of a different type from that which prevailed even half a cen-

ture ago. It is a social Churchmanship, a realization of the Kingdom of God as a present possession. Within the last twenty-five years the Church has learned many lessons. She has heard new calls; she has realized new responsibilities. It is not merely that she is to preach to men about their souls, but she realizes that she has to preach to them about their bodies also. She seeks their present salvation as well as their future. Her work is for men, not for disembodied spirits. Like Wisdom, she says, "Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of man."

2. To glorify God.

Worship must be so offered that the worshipper can take his part intelligently. S. Paul says: "I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also."¹ And S. Augustine, in S. Paul's spirit, pertinently asks:

"Would'st thou the Almighty Father please?"

and thus answers himself:

"Thou must approach the throne; not seek
To gratify self-pleasing sense
Of Music's powers, but dread to win
Vain praise for perfected success;

¹ 1 Cor. xiv., 15.

Not strive to weave a complex thread
Of harmonies—for simple souls
Too high—with words wherein to pour
An offering meet to Him you would adore.”

Here are two features of the ideal hymn: It ought to teach men: It ought not to be a mere medium for the expression of the personal feeling of the individual. If true to this standard, it will give utterance to the united mind of the faithful, as with one heart and voice they praise and magnify God.

The Book of Praise, in which our hymns are collected, differs from the Book of Prayer in two noteworthy particulars:—

(1) The Book of Praise is new. The Book of Prayer is old. Some hymns, indeed, are not new. At the first Eucharistic Service a hymn was sung by our Lord and His Apostles. It matters not whether it was one of the series of Psalms called the Hallel,¹ or not. The modern distinction between hymns and psalms is entirely arbitrary. Bede speaks of the whole Book of Psalms as called by the universal consent of Hebrews, Greeks, and Latins, “*Liber Hymnorum*.” In early times indeed, any act of praise to God was

¹ Cxiii.–cxviii.

called a hymn, provided only that it was sung. Afterward the term was confined to the restrictive use it now has.

But even in this restrictive sense, hymns are as old as Christianity itself. The New Testament gives us several. The first recorded is the Magnificat of the B. V. M. at the house of her cousin Elizabeth. Then follow the Benedictus and the Nunc Dimittis. In the first Liturgies two hymns are found enshrined, for what is the *Te Deum Laudamus* but a magnificent hymn of triumphant praise, the noblest Latin hymn we possess? Yet, grand as this hymn is, it is not more to the Western Church than the *Gloria in Excelsis*, which so beautifies our Communion Service, is to the Eastern,—the more so as its composition dates back to the first century.

After the New Testament and the Liturgic Hymns of the first ages, there are hymns of the Mediæval era. Of these, six shine with superlative brightness. They are the *Dies Iræ*, the *Stabat Mater*, the *Mater Speciosa*, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, the *Vexilla Regis*, and the *Celestial Country*. Of these, the *Dies Iræ* is the most sublime, the *Mater Speciosa* the most tender, the *Stabat Mater* the most pa-

thetic, and the Celestial Country the most beautiful,—while the two Hymns to the Holy Spirit sound the lowest depths of the soul's inner life, and give utterance to that adoring awe and reverence with which man should approach the Most High.

But the ancient materials are not many ; for the bulk of our Hymnal is modern ; the making and using of hymns on a large scale beginning with Dr. Isaac Watts, in 1705. In the course of that century thousands of hymns appeared, but Watts was the pioneer. There are now said to be 20,000 hymns in the English language, all in use somewhere. Even as late as sixty years ago, hymns were unpopular, and regarded as Methodistical ; the Non-conformists using them more than did Church people. In many of our churches the services were often merely read ; in others there was an excess of operatic music, often badly performed. But the number of the hymn writers now in the Church, and the beauty of their compositions, make honorable amends for the past.

(2) But there is another distinction. The Prayer-Book is the work of the most devout, the most loyal, and the most distinguished sons the Church has had ; all however Clergy. Probably there is

not a voice there which is not the voice of an ordained minister of the Lord.

The Hymnal, on the contrary, contains not the work of the Clergy only, but of the laymen, and of the gifted women of the Church. Here their words appear side by side with those of bishop and archbishop. Nor is this all. In the Hymnal we often hear the voices of those who, while the Church's children, as all baptized persons must be, yet have not known the mother that bore them. All are not Churchmen who are of the Church. Such, for example, were Isaac Watts himself and Philip Doddridge. They were famous Congregational ministers in their day. Yet the Church has lovingly placed their sacred songs among the songs of the most loyal of her children.

Here is Catholicity, not in word, but in deed ; for the Hymnal is common ground. Layman and priest, separatist and churchman, all meet here in a goodly company, and their voices are blended together in one triumphant song of praise. May we not hope that in this we have a foretaste of that final blending into one sweet harmonious note, when we shall all learn to sing the New Song before the throne of God. Our Hymnal, if

for nothing else, is dear to us as the first great step toward practical unity, when "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim."¹

There is a power in hymns that never dies; easily learned in the days of childhood and of youth; often repeated; seldom, if ever, forgotten;—they abide with us, a most precious heritage among all the changes of our earthly life. They form a fitting and most welcome expression for every kind of deep religious feeling; they are with us to speak of faith and hope in hours of trial and sorrow; with us to animate to all Christian effort; with us as the rich consolation of individual hearts, and as one common bond of fellowship between the living members of Christ's mystical Body.

¹ Isaiah xi. 13.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I.

DATES INTERESTING TO AMERICAN CHURCHMEN.

A.D.

- 33. The Church founded at Jerusalem (Acts ii.—see Acts xi. 26).
- 43-61. Christian missionaries arrive in Britain.
- 207. "Parts of Britain inaccessible to the Romans become subject to Christ."
- 304. Martyrdom of Alban at Verulam, Britain's proto-martyr.
- 314. Three British bishops represent the British Church in a council held at Arles in France.¹
- 431. Patrick goes from Britain as a missionary to Ireland.
- 597. *First* Italian mission enters Britain.
- 597-672. Native and Italian missionaries separately work for the complete conversion of the inhabitants of Britain.
- 673. The various missions are consolidated, and under Archbishop Theodore, a National Church of England comes into existence.
- 1066-1070. The English Church begins to fall under domination of Rome.
- 1215. King John is compelled to sign the famous Magna Charta,

¹ On the occasion of the celebration of Mr. Gladstone's eighty-fifth birthday anniversary an interesting incident occurred. The Armenian congregation in London presented to Hawarden Church a chalice, as a token of respect for its distinguished parishioner, and in their address of congratulation referred to the antiquity of their Church, which dated back to A.D. 302, and had remained ever since an independent national Church. With his usual felicity, Mr. Gladstone, in his response, said he could rightly claim for the Church of the country in which they were then standing, an antiquity fully equal to theirs, for, in A.D. 310, three British bishops were present at a council in France.

the Archbishop of Canterbury (Stephen Langton assisting the Barons against Pope Innocent III.) saying: "The English Church shall be free."

- 1497. John Cabot discovers the mainland of America and takes possession for England and for the English Church.
- 1534. England formally withdraws from the papal allegiance.
- 1559. Matthew Parker is consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury in the Chapel at Lambeth by Bishops Barlow of Chichester, Hodgkins of Bedford, Coverdale of Exeter, and Scory of Hereford.
- 1560. Pius IV. offers to recognize the English Church, provided she recognizes him as pope and yields him obedience.
- 1578. Frobisher's chaplain celebrates the Holy Communion in Newfoundland; first recorded celebration in the New World.
- 1579. *Second* Italian mission enters England.
- 1579. Rev. Francis Fletcher holds service on the Pacific Coast, at Drake's Bay, Cal.
- 1587. First recorded native baptism on the Atlantic Coast, at Roanoke, N. C.
- 1587. First child born of English parents in New World—Virginia Dare—is baptized at Roanoke.
- 1588. Sixtus V., Bishop of Rome, unsuccessfully assists the Spanish Armada against England.
- 1588. Sir Walter Raleigh sends a donation "for the propagation of the Christian religion" at Roanoke.
- 1607. First church built in New England, erected by Churchmen at Fort St. George, Sagadahoc, Me.
- 1607. First recorded sermon in New England, by Rev. Richard Seymour, a clergyman of the Church of England.
- 1607. First recorded celebration of the Holy Communion on the mainland of America, in the church at Jamestown, Va.
- 1619. First elected representative body on this continent meets in Jamestown Church, and after prayers by the rector, legislates for the Church and Commonwealth.
- 1632. Charles I., a Churchman, gives Cecil Calvert, a Roman Catholic, the Charter of Maryland.

- 1633. Churchmen in Maryland from the first are styled "Protestant Catholics."
- 1636. Archbishop Laud develops a plan for a North American Episcopate.
- 1649. The Act of Toleration in Maryland passed mainly under Protestant influences.
- 1649. Ordinance of Cromwell for "propagating the Gospel of Jesus Christ" in New England.
- 1692. Parishes in Maryland legally constituted under the Church of England.
- 1700. The celebrated Rev. Dr. Bray visits Maryland as commissary of the Bishop of London.
- 1701. On Dr. Bray's return "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" is founded in England.¹
- 1702. Revs. George Keith and Patrick Gordon, the first missionaries of the S. P. G., sail from England and land at Boston in New England.
- 1736. Rev. John Wesley two years a missionary of the S. P. G. in Georgia.
- 1736. Rev. Thomas Thompson of New Jersey sails for the Gold Coast; the first missionary of English-speaking people to Africa.
- 1738. A missionary of the S. P. G. to the Mohawk Indians reports a church of 500 members with 50 communicants.
- 1740. The S. P. G. establishes Trinity School, at New York, for the Mohawks.
- 1774. The rector of Christ Church and St. Peter's, Philadelphia, opens "in full canonicals" the first congress of the United Colonies.
- 1775. Patrick Henry, a devout Churchman, sounds in Virginia the keynote of the coming struggle for independence—"Give me liberty or give me death."
- 1776. Richard Henry Lee, a Churchman, offers the resolution declaring the thirteen colonies to be "free and independent States."
- 1782. The Aitkin Bible printed by order of Congress.

¹ This society is commonly called the S. P. G.

1783. Dr. Samuel Seabury, an S. P. G. missionary, is elected Bishop of Connecticut.
1783. Our American Church first styled "Protestant Episcopal."¹
1784. Dr. Seabury is consecrated a bishop in Scotland.
1785. The proposed Book of Common Prayer offered for adoption by our General Convention, but not accepted.
1787. The first Bishops of Pennsylvania and New York (Drs. White and Provoost) are duly consecrated in the Chapel at Lambeth Palace, by the Archbishop of Canterbury.
1789. Ratification of our Book of Common Prayer at the General Convention in Philadelphia.
1790. The first Bishop of Virginia (Dr. James Madison) consecrated in England; he was the last of our bishops consecrated abroad.
1792. Thomas John Claggett is consecrated Bishop of Maryland, in Trinity Church, New York; the *first consecration* of a bishop in the United States.
1895. Washington, the Capital of this nation, is made the see city of a Diocese in our church—over 170 bishops having been meanwhile consecrated by our Church in America since 1792, when Washington was included in the Diocese of Maryland.

¹ As to the first appearance, or official sanction of our present legal title, "Protestant Episcopal:" Bishop Perry, in his History of the American Episcopal Church, says (vol. ii., p. 5), that it was first used by a representative body in Maryland, in 1783. The document is now in the archives of the General Convention, and has the following title-paragraph: "A Declaration of fundamental Rights & Liberties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Maryland; had and made at a Convention or Meeting of the Clergy of said Church, duly assembled at Annapolis, August 13, 1783, agreeable to a vote of the General Assembly passed upon a petition presented in the Name and Behalf of the said Clergy."

APPENDIX II.

Organized dioceses of the Church in the United States, with the dates of the Conventions, Diocesan or General, in which they first appear [although not possessing, it may be, any true diocesan organization at the time], and the dates of their completed organization under bishops.¹

Diocese.	First Bishop.	Consecrated.
Connecticut, 1783	Samuel Seabury	14 Nov., 1784, in Scotland.
* Pennsylvania, 1784	William White	4 Feb., 1787, in England.
* New York, 1785	Samuel Provoost	4 Feb., 1787, in England.
Virginia, 1785	James Madison	19 Sept., 1790, in England.
* Maryland, 1786	Thomas John Claggett	17 Sept., 1792, by all four of the above.
* South Carolina, 1785	Robert Smith	13 Sept., 1795.
** Massachusetts, 1784	Edward Bass	7 May, 1797.
* New Jersey, 1784	John Croes	19 Nov., 1815.
Ohio, 1817	Philander Chase	11 Feb., 1819.
North Carolina, 1790 ...	John Stark Ravenscroft	22 May, 1823.
* Vermont, 1790	John Henry Hopkins	31 Oct., 1832.
Kentucky, 1829	Benjamin Bosworth Smith	31 Oct., 1832.
Tennessee, 1828	James Hervey Otey	14 Jan., 1834, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
†† Illinois, 1835	Philander Chase	11 Feb., 1819, styled "Chica- go," fr. 1883.
Michigan, 1832	Samuel Allen McCoskry	7 July, 1836.

¹ It is a common error to suppose that a Missionary Bishop, Assistant Bishop, Suffragan Bishop, or Bishop Coadjutor, is not a "full bishop." That this error is not merely of the unlearned, will appear from the tablet inscription in S. Paul's Church, Baltimore, set up to the memory of Bishop Kemp, in which he is described as "Consecrated Suffragan Bishop, September 1st, 1814—succeeded to the full Episcopate A.D. 1816." The truth is that Bishop Kemp was as much a bishop on the day of his consecration as he ever was. No assistant in a parish who should be appointed to the rectorship could be accurately described as having succeeded to the full priesthood. So every bishop is a full bishop—there are no deacons in Episcopal orders. Once a bishop, always a bishop. He may resign his *diocese*, but he cannot resign the *episcopate*; that is indelible.

APPENDIX II.—*Continued.*

Diocese.	First Bishop.	Consecrated.
Western New York, 1838.	Wm. Heathcote De Lancey .	9 May, 1839, fr. New York.
Georgia, 1823	Stephen Elliott.....	28 Feb., 1841.
† Louisiana, 1835	Leonidas Polk	9 Dec., 1838, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
* Delaware, 1786.....	Alfred Lee.....	12 Oct., 1841.
** Rhode Island, 1790.....	John Prentiss Kewly Henshaw	11 Aug., 1843.
** New Hampshire, 1802 ...	Carlton Chase	20 Oct., 1844.
† Alabama, 1830	Nicholas Hamner Cobbs....	20 Oct., 1844.
Missouri, 1839.....	Cicero Stephens Hawks.....	20 Oct., 1844.
** Maine, 1820	George Burgess.....	31 Oct., 1847, fr. Mass.
Indiana, 1838.....	George Upfold.....	16 Dec., 1849.
† Mississippi, 1825	William Mercer Green.....	24 Feb., 1850.
Florida, 1838.....	Francis Huger Rutledge	15 Oct., 1851.
Wisconsin, 1847.....	Jackson Kemper.....	25 Sept., 1835, fr. Mis. Jurisd., "Milwaukee," 1886.
Iowa, 1853	Henry Washington Lee.....	18 Oct., 1854.
California, 1850	William Ingraham Kip.....	28 Oct., 1853, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
Texas, 1849.....	Alexander Gregg	13 Oct., 1859.
Minnesota, 1857.....	Henry Benjamin Whipple....	23 Oct., 1859.
Kansas, 1859.....	Thomas Hubbard Vail.....	15 Dec., 1864.
Pittsburg, 1865.....	John Barrett Kerfoot.....	25 Jan., 1866, fr. Penn.
Nebraska, 1863.....	Robert Harper Clarkson	15 Nov., 1865, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
Long Island, 1868.....	Abram Newkirk Littlejohn ..	27 Jan., 1869, fr. New York.
Albany, 1868.....	William Croswell Doane....	2 Feb., 1869, fr. New York.
Easton, 1868	Henry Champlin Lay	23 Oct., 1859, fr. Maryland.
Central New York, 1868.	Frederic Dan Huntington ...	8 April, 1869, fr. New York.
Arkansas, 1871.....	Henry Niles Pierce	25 Jan., 1870, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
Central Penn., 1871.....	Mark Antony De Wolfe Howe	28 Dec., 1871, fr. Penn.
Northern N. J., 1874	William Henry Odenheimer.	13 Oct., 1859, fr. N. J., "New- ark," 1886.
Western Michigan, 1874.	Geo. De Normandie Gillespie	24 Feb., 1875, fr. Michigan.
Southern Ohio, 1875.....	Thomas Augustus Jagger ...	28 April, 1875, fr. Ohio.

APPENDIX II.—*Continued.*

Diocese.	First Bishop.	Consecrated.
Fond du Lac, 1875.....	John Henry Hobart Brown..	15 Dec., 1875, fr. Wisconsin.
Quincy, 1877.....	Alexander Burgess.....	15 May, 1878, fr. Illinois.
West Virginia, 1877.....	George William Peterkin....	30 May, 1878, fr. Virginia.
Springfield, 1877.....	George Franklin Seymour...	11 June, 1878, fr. Illinois.
East Carolina, 1883.....	Alfred Augustin Watson ...	17 April, 1884, fr. N. Carolina.
Colorado, 1887.....	John Franklin Spalding.....	31 Dec., 1873, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
Oregon, 1889.....	Benjamin Wistar Morris....	3 Dec., 1868, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
West Missouri, 1890.....	Edward Robert Atwill.....	14 Oct., 1890, fr. Missouri.
Southern Virginia, 1892..	Alfred Magill Randolph....	21 Oct., 1883, fr. Virginia.
Washington, 1895.....	fr. Maryland.
Northern Texas, 1895....	Alexander Charles Garrett...	20 Dec., 1874, fr. Mis. Jurisd.
Kentucky, 1895.....	fr. Kentucky.
California, 1895.....	fr. California.
Marquette, 1895.....	fr. Michigan.

* Dioceses marked thus (*) before their organization as dioceses were represented by clerical and lay deputies from their several States in a convention which met at New York in October, 1784.

** The Eastern Diocese was a confederation of four of the New England dioceses—Massachusetts [including Maine], Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Vermont—for the purpose of securing a bishop who might serve for them all. Massachusetts had already had two bishops, but they had both died soon after consecration. The first convention of the Eastern Diocese was held May 9, 1810, when delegates, both clerical and lay, from the four dioceses were present, and the Rev. Alexander Viets Griswold was elected Bishop, and he was consecrated May 29, 1811. This diocese dissolved of itself in 1843, when Bishop Griswold died. In 1841 Massachusetts had elected an Assistant Bishop to Bishop Griswold, to serve in that State—the Rev. Manton Eastburn, consecrated Assistant Bishop of the Eastern Diocese, and he became simply Bishop of Massachusetts on Bishop Griswold's death. Vermont had already elected a bishop in 1832. So that at the time of his death Bishop Griswold was in reality Bishop of Rhode Island and New Hampshire, with the title of Bishop of the Eastern Diocese.

+ "The Dioceses of Mississippi and Alabama, and the churches and clergy in the State of Louisiana were authorized to *associate* and join in the election of a Bishop," by the General Convention of October, 1832. In accordance with this permission delegates from those three dioceses met in New Orleans March 4, 1835, adopted a Constitution for a General Diocese under the name of the South Western Diocese, and elected the Rev. Francis L. Hawks, D.D., to be their Bishop; but he declined, and it does not appear that there ever was any other convention held under that authority.

†† Bishop Chase, consecrated 1819, resigned Ohio in 1831 and went into the West, where he became Bishop of Illinois in 1835.

APPENDIX III.

THE SENIOR BISHOPS OF THE AMERICAN CHURCH.

(The "Presiding Bishops" are marked with ¶ for distinction.)

- * ¶ 1. Samuel Seabury, Bp. of Connecticut, 14 Nov., 1784; died 25th Feb., 1796 = 11 y. 3 m.
- ¶ 2. William White, Bp. of Pennsylvania, 4 Feb., 1787; died 17th July, 1836 = 40 y. 5 m.
- ¶ 12. Alex. Viets Griswold, Bp. of Eastern Diocese, 29 May, 1811; died 15th Feb., 1843 = 6 y. 7 m.
- ¶ 18. Philander Chase, Bp. of (Ohio tr. to) Illinois, 11 Feb., 1819; died 20th Sept., 1852 = 9 y. 7 m.
- ¶ 19. Thos. Church Brownell, Bp. of Connecticut, 27 Oct., 1819; died 13th Jan., 1865 = 12 y. 4 m.
 - [25. Levi Silliman Ives, Bp. of N. Carolina, 22 Sept., 1831; dep. 1853; died 13th Oct., 1867.]
- ¶ 26. John Henry Hopkins, Bp. of Vermont, 31 Oct., 1832; died 9th Jan., 1868 = 3 y.
- ¶ 27. Benj. Bosworth Smith, Bp. of Kentucky, 31 Oct., 1832; died 31st May, 1884 = 16 y. 5 m.
 - [32. Saml. Allen McCoskry, Bp. of Michigan, 7 July, 1836; res. 1878; died 1st Aug., 1886.]
- ¶ 38. Alfred Lee, Bp. of Delaware, 12 Oct., 1841; died 12th Apl., 1887 = 2 y. 10 m.
- † 47. Horatio Southgate, Miss. Bp. of Constantinople, 26 Oct., 1844 [res. 1850] died 12th Apl., 1894 = 7 y.
- ¶ 54. John Williams, Bp. of Connecticut, 29 Oct., 1851; became presiding Bp. on death of Bp. Lee, April, 1887; Senior Bp. on death of Bp. Southgate, April, 1894; up to present time, 14 Oct., 1895, he has been Senior Bp. I

y. 6 m. Thus from 14 Nov., 1784, to 14 Oct., 1895, is in the total = 110 y. 11 m.

*Bishop Seabury, always the Senior American Bishop, was Presiding Bishop on Oct. 21, 1789, thereafter (1789-1796) the rank of Presiding Bishop was usurped by Bishop White. This usurpation was defended on the ground that Bishop Seabury's consecration by non-juring bishops was irregular; and also because he was drawing a pension from the British Government. But in the first place, Bishop White's own consecration might have been impugned on the same ground, for he himself was distinctly a non-juror; and in the second place, Bishop Seabury's retention of his "half pay" did not put him under such permanent obligation to the British Government as did the acceptance by Bishops White, Provoost and Madison, of their Episcopal orders at the hands of their English consecrators—for those three bishops only obtained English consecration under an Enabling Act of the British Parliament and by the grace and favor of duly sworn Privy Councillors of Great Britain acting under the King's Royal Warrant. On Bishop Seabury's death, however, Bishop White became Presiding Bishop by undoubted right of seniority.

† It will be observed that Bishop Southgate was Senior Bishop from April, 1887, till his death in April, 1894. During all that time, however, Bishop Williams was Presiding Bishop, and justly so, inasmuch as Bishop Southgate had no regular See. But had Bishop Southgate, after his return from Constantinople, been elected to a diocese, he would at once have become Presiding Bishop in place of Bishop Williams!!

Perhaps nothing more clearly shows the need of some effective legislation upon the always important subject as to what bishop shall be the Primate of our American Church.

APPENDIX IV.

LIST OF THE PRESENT MISSIONARY BISHOPS, WITH THEIR SEVERAL JURISDICTIONS, 1895.

(The marginal numbers refer to the Succession of American Bishops.)

These jurisdictions are *not* "dioceses," though sometimes so styled.

(Missionary bishops abroad are not included in this list.)

- 100. Wm. Hobart Hare, Miss. Bp. of Niobrara, 9 Jan., 1873
[Niobrara included the Dakotas] ; became Miss. Bp. of
SOUTH DAKOTA in 1883, relinquishing North Dakota.
- 107. John Henry Ducachet Wingfield, Miss. Bp. of NORTHERN
CALIFORNIA, 2 Nov., 1874. [Territory taken from Cali-
fornia.]
- 126. Leigh Richmond Brewer, Miss. Bp. of MONTANA, 8 Dec.,
1880.
- 133. Wm. David Walker, Miss. Bp. of NORTH DAKOTA, 20
Dec., 1883. [Territory taken from Niobrara, divided
into North and South Dakota.]
- 143. Ethelbert Talbot, Miss. Bp. of WYOMING AND IDAHO,
27 May, 1887.
- 144. James Steptoe Johnson, Miss. Bp. of WESTERN TEXAS,
6 Jan., 1888. [Territory taken from Texas, Robert W.
Barnwell Elliott, 1st Miss. Bp., 15 Nov., 1874 ; died 22
Aug., 1887.]
- 145. Abiel Leonard, Miss. Bp. of NEVADA AND UTAH, 25
Jan., 1888. [Daniel S. Tuttle, 1st Miss. Bp. of Utah, 1
May, 1867, translated to Missouri in 1886 ; Ozi W.

Whitaker, 1st Miss. Bp. of Nevada, 13 Oct., 1869, translated Assistant to Pennsylvania in 1886.]

147. John Mills Kendrick, Miss. Bp. of NEW MEXICO AND ARIZONA, 18 Jan., 1889. [Wm. F. Adams, 1st Miss. Bp., 17 Jan., 1875, resigned in 1876, is now Bp. of Easton; George K. Dunlop, 2d Miss. Bp., 21 Nov., 1880; died 12 March, 1888.]

153. Anson Rogers Graves, Miss. Bp. of THE PLATTE, 1 Jan., 1890. [Territory taken from Nebraska, *i.e.* Western Nebraska.]

163. Lemuel Henry Wells, Miss. Bp. of SPOKANE, 16 Dec., 1892. [Spokane is Eastern Washington; Thos. F. Scott, 1st Miss. Bp. of Oregon and Washington Territory, 8 Jan., 1854; died 14 July, 1867; Benj. W. Morris, 2d Miss. Bp. of O. and W. Terr., 3 Dec., 1868, became Miss. Bp. of Oregon in 1880; John A. Paddock, 3d Miss. Bp. of Washington, 15 Dec., 1880, became Miss. Bp. of Olympia in 1892, relinquishing Spokane.]

164. Wm. Crane Gray, Miss. Bp. of SOUTHERN FLORIDA, 27 Dec., 1892. [Territory taken from Florida.]

165. Francis Key Brooke, Miss. Bp. of OKLAHOMA, 6 Jan., 1893. [His jurisdiction includes also the whole Indian Territory.]

166. Wm. Morris Barker, Miss. Bp. of WESTERN COLORADO, 25 Jan., 1893. [Territory taken from Colorado.] He became Miss. Bp. of OLYMPIA in 1895. [Olympia is Western Washington; Thos. F. Scott, 1st Miss. Bp. of Oregon and Washington Territory, 8 Jan., 1854; died 14 July, 1867; Benj. W. Morris, 2d Miss. Bp. of O. and W. Terr., 3 Dec., 1868, became Miss. Bp. of Oregon in 1880; John A. Paddock, 3d Miss. Bp. of Washington, 15 Dec., 1880, became Miss. Bp. of Olympia in 1892, relinquishing Spokane, and died 4 March, 1894.]

Peter Trimble Rowe [Elect], Miss. Bp. of ALASKA.

..... Miss. Bp. of Asheville, N. C.

..... Miss. Bp. of Duluth.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

THE OLD CHURCH IN THE NEW LAND.

Lectures on Church History.

By the Rev. C. ERNEST SMITH, Rector of St. Michael and All Angels', Baltimore. With a Preface by the Bishop of Maryland. 12mo, \$1.25.

"We heartily endorse the recommendation of the Bishop of Maryland, and we go further; we should say that this little book is perhaps the very best historical account of the Church of England for family reading that we have ever seen; and an attentive congregation to which these lectures should be read would be well prepared to vindicate the position of the Anglican Church against the assaults of either Rome or Geneva. It is not a controversial book, but its statements are so plain as to make agreement superfluous."—CHURCH STANDARD, PHILADELPHIA.

"Here is a book for every member of the Brotherhood to own and study."
—ST. ANDREWS' CROSS, N. Y.

"The book ought to be widely read. It is full of life and movement. The writer has clothed the dry bones of ecclesiastical history with a comely and attractive form, and breathed into it the breath of life. . . . They differ in several important points from anything which has been published before in America. . . . For the general reader, for the young, and for those uniformed as to the history of our Mother Church, for the season of Lent, for lay readers, and for Parish libraries, this will be found an almost invaluable book."—CHURCHMAN, N. Y.

"The lectures give a very clear and succinct account of the rise, source, and progress of the Christian Church, of the early heroes of Christianity, such as St. Patrick and St. Columba, the Anglican Church under the Saxons, under the Normans, the Reformation, Puritanism, and lastly the American Church. There is an especially interesting chapter devoted to 'Shakespeare, a son of the Reformation.'"—NATIONAL CHURCH.

CALL TO CONFIRMATION.

A Manual of Instruction for Candidates.

By the Rev. C. ERNEST SMITH, M.A., Rector of the Church of St. Michael and All Angels', Baltimore, Md., author of "The Old Church in the New Land," "In the Household of Faith."
18mo, paper covers, 12 cents *net*; or bound in cloth, 25 cents.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK.

NEW BOOKS.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF BELIEF: Being Notes Introductory to the Study of Theology.

By the Right Hon. ARTHUR JAMES BALFOUR, author of "A Defence of Philosophic Doubt." Crown 8vo, 374 pages, \$2.00.

"Mr. Balfour's 'Foundations of Belief' is a book rather of destructive than constructive criticism. It succeeds to a very remarkable degree in breaking down the pretensions of materialistic science to claim the whole field of human knowledge and belief under the term naturalism. The author has been successful in showing that religious instinct and theology stand as warranties of truth on a metaphysic basis of belief which is, at least, as strong as that on which science stands. This is a great step toward proving the utter failure, so far, of scientific discovery and speculation to explode the claims of Christian revelation."

—CHURCHMAN, NEW YORK.

PERSECUTION AND TOLERANCE. Being the Hulsean Lectures Preached before the University of Cambridge in 1893-4.

By M. CREIGHTON, D.D., Oxon. and Cam., Lord Bishop of Peterborough. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

A LENT IN LONDON: A Course of Sermons on Social Subjects Organized by the London Branch of the Christian Social Union, and Preached in the Churches of St. Edmund, Lombard Street, and St. Mary-le-Strand, during Lent, 1895.

With a Preface by HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, \$1.25.

***This volume contains Sermons by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Rev. Edmund McClure, M.A., Rev. T. Hancock, M.A., Rev. R. R. Dolling, Rev. Wilfrid Richmond, M.A., Rev. H. Russell Wakefield, M.A., Rev. J. Llewelyn Davies, D.D., Rev. Bernard R. Wilson, M.A., Rev. J. Charles Cox, LL.D., F.S.A., Rev. H. C. Shuttleworth, M.A., Rev. Canon Barnett, M.A., Rev. Stewart D. Headlam, B.A., Rev. Prebendary Harry Jones, M.A., Rev. G. Sarson, M.A., Rev. Percy Dearmer, B.A., Rev. Canon Henry Scott Holland, M.A., Rev. E. F. Russell, M.A., Rev. W. C. G. Lang, M.A., Rev. A. Chandler, M.A., Rev. Prebendary Eyton, Rev. T. C. Fry, D.D., Rev. A. L. Lilley, M.A., and Rev. W. C. Gordon Lang.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF JOHN KETTLEWELL. With Details of the History of the Non-Jurors.

By the author of "Nicholas Ferrar: His Household and His Friends." Edited, with an Introduction, by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

NEW BOOK BY A. K. H. B.

OCCASIONAL AND IMMEMORIAL DAYS.

By the Very Rev. A. K. H. BOYD, D.D. (Edin.), LL.D. (St. And.), First Minister of St. Andrews; author of "Twenty-five Years of St. Andrews," "The Recreations of a Country Parson," etc. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

***This volume consists of Discourses which have not appeared in any periodical, and which are not autobiographical.

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., PUBLISHERS, NEW YORK.

A SELECTED LIST
OF
RECENT THEOLOGICAL BOOKS
PUBLISHED BY
LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO.
NEW YORK

BISHOP A. C. A. HALL.

The Virgin Mother. Retreat Addresses on the Life of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as Told in the Gospels. With an Appended Essay on the Virgin Birth of Our Lord. By the Rt. Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont. 12mo, \$1.25.

"It is often said, and the saying is true, that Protestantism and Anglicanism have lost something of sweet Christian tenderness in their extreme reaction from the semi-idolatrous cultus of the Blessed Virgin which prevailed in the Middle Ages. We have not the slightest tendency to that form of doctrinal aberration; nor would it be possible, we suppose, for any clear-minded Englishman or American to join in the glowing but hyperbolic addresses to the Mother of our Lord which are found in the liturgies of Oriental Churches; yet it does seem that something has been lost in our habitual forgetfulness of the human being to whom our blessed Lord in His earthly life was nearest and dearest, and who, doubtless, of all the sons and daughters of men, was—nay, perhaps still is—nearest and dearest to Him. In this little volume, Bishop Hall very admirably and delicately discourses of the Blessed Virgin with the reverent affection which is due to her, and yet without the slightest approach to the extravagances which our church has rightly and wisely banished. In a brief appendix, he has written a few timely words on the subject of the virgin birth of our Lord, considered as an article of the Christian faith."—THE CHURCH STANDARD, PHILADELPHIA.

CANON SCOTT HOLLAND.

God's City: Four Addresses delivered at St. Asaph on the Spiritual and Ethical Value of Belief in the Church. To which are added six sermons on kindred subjects. By the Rev. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"As to their teaching, we think them to be admirable models of the spirit in which instruction concerning the church should be given. . . . The doctrine is both full and strong, and is enriched by that wealth of illustration which characterizes all the author's writings."—THE CHURCHMAN, NEW YORK.

"We sometimes wonder why some sermons find their way into print; but sermons such as these are in character of an inspiration that not only find their way into print, but into the hearts and lives of all who hear or read them."

—THE LIVING CHURCH, CHICAGO.

CANON LIDDON.

Clerical Life and Work. A Collection of Sermons with an Essay on "The Priest in his Inner Life." By the Rev. HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., LL.D., D.C.L., late Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"This is a collection of sermons addressed at various times to the clergy. They present a high and serious view of clerical life, which had been slowly developing in the preacher's mind from early life.

There is very little of distinctly 'High Church' opinions in them, but they take a strong hold on the subject in hand, and handle it in no ordinary way. We especially commend to our clerical friends the sermons on *Our Lord's Example the Strength of His Ministers*, *The Secret of Clerical Power*, and *The Moral Value of a Mission from Christ*."—THE INDEPENDENT.

NEW VOLUME OF CANON LIDDON'S LIFE OF DR. PUSEY.

Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. Edited and prepared for publication by the Rev. J. O. Johnston, M.A., Vicar of All Saints', Oxford, and the Rev. Robert J. Wilson, D.D., Warden of Keble College. 4 vols., 8vo. With Portraits and Illustrations. Vol. I. and II., \$9.00 *net* Vol. III., \$4.50 *net*

"This volume deals with what may be considered, on the whole, the most important period of all in the history of the Oxford revival."—STANDARD.

"Our first feeling in laying down this long expected 'Life of Dr. Pusey' is one of satisfaction that so important a subject had so able a biographer. In whatever age Dr. Pusey had lived, his life would have been worth recording, for it was great in its natural gifts, great also in its powers of devotion. . . . Here as in his most admirable commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Dr. Liddon takes nothing for granted. He is at great pains not only to make every name and event intelligible, but fresh and living. A sentence in a letter of Dr. Arnold's is a trifle obscure—a foot-note explains it. An epoch which in any other hands would have been dull and uninteresting to the English public, Dr. Pusey's studies in Germany, becomes under Dr. Liddon one of the freshest chapters in the book. Eichorn, Tholuck, Schleiermacher, and Neander are living portraits. And yet all this illustrative matter is kept carefully subordinate. You never forget Dr. Pusey. The author is lost in his subject."—THE CHURCHMAN.

"The result proves that it is well worth waiting for. Valuable as is this work for the portraiture of a great man, it has an especial value for the light it throws upon the Oxford movement from contemporaneous history and documents. The work is indeed most complete and projected on a grand scale, as is due to one who played so 'profoundly influential' a part in the great religious awakening of this century. . . .

"As a literary undertaking it exhibits the tenderness of touch, the grasp of details, the felicity of expression, the ripe scholarship, the thorough acquaintance with all the literature that could illustrate his subject, that mark all the writings of Dr. Liddon."—THE LIVING CHURCH.

"More has been expected of Canon Liddon's biography than from any other book that has attempted to deal with the great Church Revival of the century, and the just anticipations of those who are interested in it will be realized. Canon Liddon restrains himself from every temptation to excess of statement or elaboration. Whenever important points are treated, no pains are spared to give accurate and full information, and his opinions are never wanting where they are demanded. The further volumes in this biography will be awaited with eager interest."—THE OUTLOOK.

REV. C. ERNEST SMITH.

The Old Church in the New Land. Lectures on Church History. By the Rev. C. ERNEST SMITH, M.A., Rector of the Church of St. Michael and All Angels, Baltimore, Md., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Maryland. With a Preface by the Bishop of Maryland. Crown 8vo, cloth, \$1.25.

"We heartily endorse the recommendation of the Bishop of Maryland, and we go further; we should say that this little book is perhaps the very best historical account of the Church of England for family reading that we have ever seen; and an attentive congregation to which these lectures should be read would be well prepared to vindicate the position of the Anglican Church against the assaults of either Rome or Geneva. It is not a controversial book, but its statements are so plain as to make argument superfluous."—THE CHURCH STANDARD.

"These lectures deserve all the praise we can give them. We strongly recommend their addition to parish libraries, and their study to teachers, lay readers, and to not a few of the clergy. They retell the story of the old church in the new land with an accuracy of detail both in fact and doctrine that is refreshing, and with a style as vigorous and pointed as it is clear."—THE AMERICAN CHURCH ALMANAC, 1895.

"Here is a book for every member of the Brotherhood to own and study. Mr. Smith very justly says: 'A knowledge of some of the chief facts in the history of the church has become almost a necessity to every churchman, and there are, consequently, few subjects upon which lecture-sermons can more appropriately be preached in our day than on Church History, especially on the history of our own branch. To some persons this may seem a very unedifying kind of a subject; they prefer what is known as "Gospel preaching"; they have indeed no interest in any other; and if, unfortunately, they are compelled to listen to any other, they imagine there is no help in it, and are none the better for it, but rather the worse.'

"This is all true enough, and when this instruction is given with a clearness and freshness that illuminate the subject, it becomes a pleasure as well as a duty to receive it. . . . With a scholarship which is never heavy, with a belief in the Catholic Church which never descends into mere partisanship, the lectures, in the words of the Bishop of Maryland who writes the preface, admirably fulfill their purpose 'to trace the links of that continuity (between the Church in America and the Church in England) to make churchmen feel sure, through them of an apostolic origin, to help them know that this is no late-born sect, but that in it we are in the very "fellowship of the Apostles." . . . Make yourself a . . . present of this book, read it, digest it, and then lend it as widely as possible among your friends."

—ST. ANDREW'S CROSS.

"The whole story is told in strong and clear outline, in a very interesting and instructive way, and any one who follows the plain teaching in this little volume cannot fail to be convinced of the identity of our church with that church which the Lord Jesus founded. We wish that every layman would read it, for we are sure he would find it full of strength and truth."—THE LIVING CHURCH.

THE BAMPTON LECTURES FOR 1893.

Inspiration: Eight Lectures on the Early History and Origin of the Doctrine of Biblical Inspiration. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1893. By the Rev. W. SANDAY, M.A., D.D., LL.D., Dean Ireland's Professor of Exegesis, Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, Preacher at Whitehall. 8vo, \$4.00.

ABBÉ FOUARD.

Saint Paul and his Missions. By the ABBÉ CONSTANT FOUARD. Translated with the Author's sanction and co-operation by the Rev. George F. X. Griffith. With 2 Maps. Small 8vo, cloth, gilt top, \$2.00.

"This work may not have the breadth of learning which one finds in the 'St. Paul' of Conybeare and Howson; it certainly has not the buoyancy of Archdeacon Farrar's work on the same subject; it makes no pretension to the minute accuracy of Lewin; but it is a very admirable work, for all that, and to the average reader it will be even more instructive than its predecessors. Its author, of course, is a clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church; but his candor is above all praise, and his account of the church in apostolic days is absolutely faithful to historical fact. Indeed, we find that he explicitly states facts which writers in our own church would hesitate to affirm.

The candor and simplicity which we find everywhere in the historical treatment of our author's subject we find not less striking when he deals with doctrine; and in his discussion of the Epistle to the Romans, his treatment of justification by faith is so thoroughly Scriptural that one cannot help wondering at the wearisome scholastic logomachy which, in the sixteenth century, so needlessly obscured the plain teaching of the Word of God. Taking it all in all, we have nothing but commendation for the Abbé Fouard's 'St. Paul.'"—THE CHURCH STANDARD.

"We give a hearty welcome to this new book of the Abbé Fouard's. His 'Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity' will have raised the expectations of students who have known it, but we think that even they will be hardly prepared for so delightful and interesting a book as this of the life of St. Paul. With such good work as that of Conybeare and Howson, Lewin and Archdeacon Farrar, the English scholar scarcely expects to find any fresh treatment of so well worn a theme. But whilst it is true that there is not much that is new, the setting and presentation of St. Paul's life is delightfully fresh and interesting. The descriptions of his journeys are given with all that color and life which French artists give to their landscapes, and long quotations from his letters are quite skillfully interwoven into the text, so that we feel that we know St. Paul better than we did before we took up the Abbé's work.

There are good maps, a full index, and an abundant supply of notes and references. We have had no opportunity of comparing the translation with the original, but we can say that it is eminently readable. On the whole, we believe there are few lives of St. Paul which the ordinary Bible student will find more attractive and helpful than this of the learned Abbé."—THE CHURCHMAN.

"This volume follows in connected series 'Saint Peter and the First Years of Christianity,' by the same author and from the same publishers. The Abbé Fouard has been fortunate in his translator, who has succeeded in carrying over into his English rendering much of the vivacious and eloquent perspicuity of the original French work. Abbé Fouard has done his work in this volume with great freedom. He touches the great notes of Pauline doctrine strongly, and proclaims them with an enthusiasm wholly his own. The translation enriches English theology with a volume catholic in tone and scholarship, and whose merits in the original form have been recognized in France."—THE INDEPENDENT.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

'The Christ, the Son of God.' A Life of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. With an Introduction by CARDINAL MANNING. 2 vols., small 8vo, cloth, gilt top, with 3 Maps, \$4.00.

St. Peter and the First Years of Christianity. With an Introduction by CARDINAL GIBBONS. With 3 Maps. Small 8vo, cloth, gilt top, \$2.00.

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES, 1894.

The Permanent Value of the Book of Genesis as an Integral Part of the Christian Revelation. By the Rev. C. W. E. Body, M.A., D.C.L., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Interpretation in the General Theological Seminary, New York ; Sometime Provost of Trinity College, Toronto, and Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, \$1.50.

"No greater service could have been rendered at this time to the average body of the church clergy than these four lectures by Prof. Body. Within the limited space restricted to the Paddock Lectures he has managed to give a comprehensive review of the so-called Higher Criticism, its history and principal authors, the various theories and conclusions of its literary analysis of the Old Testament, bringing to the front its unresolved problems, and philosophic or logical objections that are fatal to its assumptions, and, above all, bringing out that moral and spiritual character and purpose which stamps the *Biblia Sacra* as a Revelation from God for the behoof of man, but which mere perfunctory critical scholarship as completely misses, as the science of botany would do that confined itself to mere dried leaves, stamens, and pistils, and details of classification, without leading to the consideration of properties and uses, relation to pharmacopeia, commercial value, or benefit to mankind. Any Christian will be delighted with the incidental replies to Dr. Briggs, and the masterly exposé of critical fallacies among German writers, especially the final discrediting of the presumptuous and utterly groundless dogmatism of such writers of the extreme school of Kuenen and Wellhausen.

The fourth lecture on Creation and Paradise, and the fifth on the Deluge and the Patriarchs are intensely interesting, and show how Prof. Sayce and the Monuments of Archæology are rapidly making short work of much of the learned ignorance of the Higher Criticisms. There are several interesting appendices."

—THE CHURCH ECLECTIC, UTICA, N. Y.

THE BISHOP PADDOCK LECTURES, 1892.

The Sacramental System Considered as the Extension of the Incarnation. By MORGAN DIX, S.T.D., D.C.L., Rector of Trinity Church, New York. Crown 8vo, 260 pages, \$1.50.

"We have been always hoping that the church of these scientific days might be able to show how deeply grounded the sacramental system is in nature, and the first of these lectures leads us to feel that we shall not be disappointed. Dr. Dix . . . shows what the teaching of the church respecting nature has been ; . . . what the remedial and restorative effect of the Incarnation in nature may be. . . . It is impossible in the short space of a review to do justice to the argument in these two first chapters, which we feel to be of great importance in these days."—THE CHURCHMAN.

"Presented, as it is in these pages, in a fresh and lively way, in clear and persuasive argument, it touches the soul, excites the imagination, and deepens one's faith The treatment is scholarly and philosophical, the discussion logical and conclusive, the style clear and calm, and the volume is timely and helpful."

—THE LIVING CHURCH.

"It is most gratifying to have Dr. Dix's lectures on the sacramental system in permanent and available form. The volume will prove a valuable addition to the religious literature, not of the day only, but of the age. . . . The logical arrangement of the material is admirable, and the diction at once stately and precise."

—ST. ANDREW'S CROSS.

THE DEAN OF CHRIST CHURCH.

Studies in the Christian Character. Sermons with an Introductory Essay. By FRANCIS PAGET, D.D., Dean of Christ Church, Oxford; Sometime Vicar of Bromsgrove. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

CANON BRIGHT.

Waymarks in Church History. By the Rev. WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"The present volume . . . is the production of a man who has cultivated the habit of going to original sources for his materials, and who is at once a scholar and a thinker. While he is everywhere passionately devoted to the Church of England, he is also a universal scholar, and his writing can be trusted as substantially correct. He is one of the few English writers of to-day who carries the methods of literature into the study of theology and the writing of church history, and his sketches in every instance are fresh and strong and clear."—BOSTON HERALD.

"Dr. Bright is so well known to readers in church history that, with them at least, no book of his needs any recommendation. This volume, however, appeals to a wider audience than students of history. It is as truly theological as it is historical . . . we have in succession a brief but scholarly treatment of the great religious questions of the first eight centuries of the church's life; and our interest is maintained by the manner in which they have been grouped round living men. . . . Twelve valuable appendices give a more complete treatment of some of the serious questions raised in the book than was possible in the text. . . . Enough has been said, we hope, to persuade the lover of theological books to include this in his next purchase, for of the many valuable books that are being added to our theological libraries, there are few more immediately useful than the one we have noticed."

—THE CHURCHMAN.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Faith and Life. Readings for the Greater Holy Days, and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity. Compiled from Ancient Writers. Second Edition. Small 8vo, \$1.75.

Morality in Doctrine. Sermons. Small 8vo, \$2.00.

Lessons from the Lives of Three Great Fathers: St. Athanasius, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine. With Appendices. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"The lectures, as their title indicates, are rather anecdotal than biographical. As such they are suggestive, and will doubtless help readers that are not themselves students of the Fathers, to a clearer conception of the characters and services of the three men."—CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

The Incarnation as a Motive Power. Sermons. Second Edition. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

REV. HERBERT BRANSTON GRAY.

"Men of Like Passions": Being Characters of some Bible Heroes and Other Sermons. Preached to Bradfield Boys. By the Rev. HERBERT BRANSTON GRAY, D.D., Warden of Bradfield College, Berks. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

"The first thing that strikes the reader of these sermons will assuredly be their fitness for their purpose. . . . The sermons are partly sermons on the saints of the Prayer Book and partly on some of the Old Testament characters, with one or two occasional commemorative discourses. All are brief, pointed, and thoughtful, and we can assure our readers that they are well worth the study of much older and more instructed hearers than those for whom they are prepared."

—THE CHURCHMAN.

"They are manly in tone, earnest in spirit, and must have been very interesting to listen to. Like a master Bowman he cleans the mark he aims at, and under such teaching the boys of Bradfield ought to develop into manly men. They may be read with advantage by anybody, but every one who has to do with boys, parents as well as teachers, would find very much that is helpful and profitable."—PACIFIC CHURCHMAN.

REV. A. J. HARRISON.

The Repose of Faith: In View of Present-Day Difficulties. By the Rev. ALEXANDER J. HARRISON, B.D., Vicar of Lightcliffe, Evidential Missioner of the Church Parochial Mission Society, and Lecturer of the Christian Evidence Society, Boyle Lecturer, 1892, etc. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Problems of Christianity and Scepticism. Lessons from Twenty Years' Experience in the Field of Christian Evidence. Crown 8vo, \$2.25.

"So wise and practical a volume as this cannot fail to do great good. . . . The style of the book is popular throughout. . . . The third book is a summary of lessons drawn from his own history. It describes the work he has done in the line of the subject of the volume, a work which has been his specialty for a long time, and considers all practical matters suggested at one or another point. The whole volume, and this portion of it in particular, will be found serviceable by all who have opportunities of influencing those of a sceptical frame of mind. We commend the work to Christians also, not merely for its valuable statements of their views of truth, but quite as much because of its importance as an example of good sense, courtesy, and tact in religious argument."—THE CONGREGATIONALIST.

The Church in Relation to Sceptics. A Conversational Guide to Evidential Work. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"Mr. Harrison has had many years' practical experience in the work to which this may be regarded as a hand-book, and an extremely good one it is. . . . The book is a most helpful one, and every one engaged in pastoral work would find it an invaluable help."—PACIFIC CHURCHMAN.

DEAN LUCKOCK.

The History of Marriage, Jewish and Christian,
in Relation to Divorce and Certain Forbidden Degrees.
By the Rev. HERBERT MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D., Dean
of Lichfield. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

"This volume is full of original and patient research, characterized by broad historical grasp and ample learning, and written in a pleasant and agreeable style."

—THE LIVING CHURCH.

CANON MACCOLL.

Life Here and Hereafter. Sermons. By the Rev.
MALCOLM MACCOLL, M.A., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.
Crown 8vo, \$2.25.

CANON NEWBOLT.

Speculum Sacerdotum; or, The Divine Model of the
Priestly Life. By the Rev. W. C. E. NEWBOLT, M.A.,
Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"We have nothing but praise for this beautiful collection of addresses which Dr. Liddon's able successor has, to use his own modest phrase, 'submitted to the kindness and forbearance of those whose lives are a constant exposition of the inspired words of the apostle, in the ranks of the Anglican clergy. . . . The author knows whereof he speaks, and, accordingly, every word tells. We know of no book that would give such real help to the clergy as this, none that would be so suitable as a gift to those about to be ordained on Trinity Sunday. Such encouragement and warning given at the outset of a man's ministry might change and uplift it.'"

—THE CHURCHMAN, NEW YORK.

"We consider it a great pity that such a book as this, so freighted with instruction, so full of spirituality, so graceful in expression, so gracious in spirit, should be sent out under a title which implies that it is intended for the clergy only. There is a compensation, however, in the thought that every clergyman who reads it will be likely to preach it over and over again to the people of his charge."

—THE CHURCH STANDARD, PHILADELPHIA.

". . . A book which every clergyman ought to read and re-read till he has thoroughly assimilated it and wrought it into the very texture of his being. Candidates for Holy Orders, and the younger clergy especially, should make a special study of it. The book is invaluable. . . ."—PACIFIC CHURCHMAN.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Counsels of Faith and Practice: Being Sermons Preached
on Various Occasions. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown
8vo, \$1.50.

"What men are crying out for is not so much intellectual as spiritual wisdom; not so much theology as the application of theology to their own spiritual needs. And this need is abundantly met by those strong, thoughtful, and stimulating 'Counsels of Faith and Practice.'"—THE CHURCHMAN.

CANON T. T. CARTER.

Nicholas Ferrar: His Household and his Friends. Edited by the Rev. T. T. CARTER, M.A., Hon. Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. With Portrait engraved after a picture by Cornelius Janssen at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo, \$1.75.

"The little volume before us is a real boon to the church. It might well be made a part of the Lent reading of those who would know what types of saintliness, after the ancient model, the Anglican Church has been able to produce."—LIVING CHURCH.

BISHOP COPLESTON.

Buddhism, Primitive and Present; in Magadha and Ceylon. By REGINALD STEPHEN COPLESTON, D.D., Bishop of Colombo, President of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. 8vo, \$5.00.

"Notwithstanding the numerous works on Buddhism recently issued, there was room for a book which, neglecting the side-growths, should undertake to give a continuous history of the primitive faith of Gotama. This task Bishop Copleston has performed with excellent judgment and skill."—THE NATION, NEW YORK.

REV. WYLLYS REDE, M.A.

The Communion of Saints. By the Rev. WYLLYS REDE, M.A., Rector of Emmanuel Church, Rockford, Illinois. With a Preface by Lord Halifax. Crown 8vo, \$1.25.

"The substance of this book was delivered in a course of lectures at St. Mark's, Evanston, Ill., during the Lent of 1892. There is an introduction by Lord Halifax, President of the English Church Union, which is in itself a clear statement of the doctrine which Mr. Rede expounds in the book. But we do not agree with the assertion on the title-page that it is a 'Lost Link in the Church's Creed.' Whatever obscuration it suffered in past days, it has now emerged from into the very forefront of church teaching. However, if this was one of the motives which led to the production of the book, we are disposed to rejoice in the assumption to which we are indebted for a very clever and sympathetic work. The leading idea of the book is the permanence of relationships in the Body of Christ, which is His Church, and the Communion of Saints.

There is a chapter on 'Prayers for the Dead,' which puts that matter in a very clear and reasonable light. The book is valuable as a clear exposition of the teaching of the church concerning the fellowship, the brotherhood which in her mind exists between all who are baptized into the Church of Christ, whether living or departed. And it will be found no less valuable as affording the truest and most efficacious consolation to all the sad company of those who grieve because their friends are not. One turns away with almost angry impatience from the wearisome commonplaces with which many good people seek to bind up the breaking heart—for they act like salt upon a raw wound. It is only in the truth that all are one in Christ, the doctrine of the Communion of Saints, that any healing for such sorrow resides. Therefore, both on this account and for the clear statement of this doctrine, the book is a very valuable one, and deserves to be not only widely read by church people, but carefully digested."—PACIFIC CHURCHMAN.

The Inheritance of the Saints ; or, Thoughts on the Communion of Saints and the Life of the World to Come. Collected chiefly from English Writers by L. P. With a Preface by the Rev. H. Scott Holland, M.A., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

"We can heartily commend it as full of sweet thoughts. It is not at all authoritative, but there is nothing authoritative in these subjects. The devout will read it and bless God."—STANDARD OF THE CROSS.

"Selected and put together with much care and skill, and under the guiding motive of a dominant churchly spirit, and a strong desire to help the children of faith to realize on earth the reality and nearness of the world to come as well as their own relation to the City and Kingdom of God."—THE INDEPENDENT.

"Though this admirable volume is a compilation of the thoughts of others it will be as widely read, we believe, as though it were the original work of its author. The book is well arranged, the subjects for the most part being illustrated by a text, passages from authors in prose or verse, and a prayer. It would make a suitable and acceptable Easter gift."—THE CHURCHMAN.

Verba Verbi Dei: The Words of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Harmonized by the Author of "Charles Lowder." With an Introduction on the Different Periods in Our Lord's Life on Earth. Crown 8vo, \$1.50.

"This is a book which everybody ought to have at hand. It contains the words of our Lord alone, and there are times when one cares to read or think of no other words than His. Even apostles and prophets may sometimes be properly included in the words of Saint Thomas à Kempis: 'Let all the doctors hold their peace; speak Thou alone to me.' The words are arranged in successive periods, including (1) the words of our Saviour as a child, at His baptism, and in the temptation; (2) at the beginning of His ministry; (3) during His first public ministry in Galilee; (4) during His ministry in Judea, and subsequently to the last Passover; (5) during the week of His passion; (6) during the great Forty Days, and afterwards to Annanias and St. Paul. We heartily commend this compilation to all students of Holy Scripture."

—THE CHURCH STANDARD.

"The book is chiefly intended for devotional use, and its unique plan, its lucid arrangement, and its consistent self-restriction to the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord, will assuredly give it a very high place among books of that class."

—THE CHURCHMAN.

REV. G. R. PRYNNE.

The Truth and Reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, Proved from Holy Scripture, the Teaching of the Primitive Church, and the Book of Common Prayer. By GEORGE RUNDLE PRYNNE, M.A., Vicar of St. Peter's, Plymouth; Author of "The Eucharistic Manual," etc. Crown 8vo, \$1.25.

"An admirable presentation of the subject. Mr. Prynn's book is brief and readable, and contains in a concise form some of the most salient facts and arguments which have been adduced by learned divines in support of the truth and reality of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."—THE CHURCHMAN.

REV. RICHARD W. HILEY, D.D.

A Year's Sermons. Based upon some of the Scriptures appointed for each Sunday Morning. By the Rev. RICHARD W. HILEY, D.D., of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, Vicar of Wighill, Tadcaster, Yorkshire. In two volumes. Vol. I., January—June. Vol. II., July—December. Crown 8vo, each, \$2.00.

"Very plain, practical sermons, which it is at once a pleasure and a profit to read. Thoroughly evangelistic, they are yet eminently adapted to the needs and cares of the every-day man."—THE CHURCHMAN.

THE ORACLES OF PAPIAS.

The Oracles Ascribed to Matthew by Papias of Hierapolis: A Contribution to the Criticism of the New Testament. With Appendices on the Authorship of the *De Vita Contemplativa*, the Date of the Crucifixion, and the Date of the Martyrdom of Polycarp. Crown 8vo, \$2.00.

CANON AND MRS. S. A. BARNETT.

Practicable Socialism: Essays on Social Reform. By the Rev. Canon and Mrs. S. A. BARNETT. New and Enlarged Edition. Crown 8vo, \$1.50.

"These papers are really practical and helpful in their suggestions to people who want to do something to help the poor."—SCOTSMAN.

"In republishing these essays it is not too much to say that the authors have made society deeply their debtors. . . . Every social reformer will be the better for the perusal of this book."—DAILY TELEGRAPH.

"It is a very practical and admirable work and still timely and appropriate. We value this volume the more highly because while quite as practical and suggestive as any other, it is pervaded by a decided and helpful Christian spirit and tone."

—BOSTON CONGREGATIONALIST.

REV. F. W. PULLER, M.A.

The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome. By F. W. PULLER, M.A., Mission Priest of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley, Oxford. Crown 8vo, \$2.25.

"Our earnest recommendation of this book can be best emphasized by the eulogy which the Bishop of Lincoln pronounces—and no one could be fitter to pronounce it—on 'the brilliancy of the Christian spirit which runs through it all.'"

—GUARDIAN, LONDON.

"An excellent compendium for American churchmen now, when the Roman question has taken a new turn in this country . . . no one can afford to despise a carefully digested manual like this."—THE CHURCHMAN, NEW YORK.

NEW BOOK BY A. K. H. B.

St. Andrews and Elsewhere: Glimpses of Some Gone and of Things Left. By A. K. H. BOYD, D.D., LL.D., First Minister of St. Andrews; Author of "Recreations of a Country Parson," "Twenty-five Years of St. Andrews," etc. 8vo, \$4.00.

"This volume has one serious fault. It is too full of good stories. . . . The truth is that this is a very enjoyable volume, and the author himself is always a source of delight."—NORTH BRITISH DAILY MAIL.

"In the present book will be found a series of reminiscences of Dean Stanley, of Canon Hugh Pearson, and of Mr. Froude. There are plenty of anecdotes about all three—some racy enough."—TIMES.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Twenty-five Years of St. Andrews, 1865 to 1890.
2 vols., 8vo. Vol. I. 1867-1878, \$3.00. Vol. II. 1878-1890, \$3.00.

"These reminiscences are so unique that one can hardly place them. They present Dr. Boyd's social life and, to some degree, his personality in a very strong light. They contain something characteristic of nearly everybody. The pages are full of bright and entertaining matter. . . . We are certain that not since Boswell's 'Life of Dr. Johnson,' has a more entertaining book of notable sketches and conversations been written.

These volumes will have a permanent interest for all who have a desire to know something about many of the most notable persons in England and Scotland during the last half of the nineteenth century."—THE OUTLOOK.

REV. H. E. HALL, M.A.

Manual of Christian Doctrine. Chiefly intended for Confirmation Classes. By the Rev. H. E. HALL, M.A., Vicar of S. Benet and All Saints', Kentish Town, N.W.; Author of "Leadership not Lordship," "The Ritualists and the Reformation." With a Preface by the Rev. W. H. Hutchings, M.A., Rector of Kirby Misperton, and Rural Dean. Fcap. 8vo, 80 pages, 30 cents.

This manual aims at helping the teacher as well as the taught, and is therefore of a more distinctly theological character than many of a similar kind that are already in existence.

The author interprets the Prayer Book in the light of Catholic Truth, taking antiquity and not novelty for his guide. He adheres to the traditional teaching of Western Christendom, and is careful, in exalting the gift of Confirmation, not to depreciate that of Baptism. He is alive, too, to the practical advantage of separating the period of life for the reception of Confirmation from that of the initial Sacrament, in order that fresh grace and strength may be vouchsafed to the young, just before they have to meet new temptations and to go forth into the world.

Although the manual is especially intended as a help in giving Confirmation classes, much of it may have a wider use, either as the basis of a series of instructions, or for catechising in church and in the schools.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01009 3146